DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 475 AC 005 289
By-Ringgenberg, Clayton
Local Government Training Programs, Problems, and Needs in Iowa.
Iowa Univ., Iowa City. Inst. of Public Affairs.
Pub Date 68
Note-81p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.15
Descriptors-*City Officials, Community Services, *County Officials, *Educational Needs, Federal Programs, General Education, *Government Employees, Higher Education, Individual Characteristics, *Inservice Education, Management Development, On the Job Training, Supervisory Training
Identifiers-Higher Education Act of 1965, *Iowa

A report, providing guidelines for the Iowa State Advisory Council, deals with inservice training and the role of Title I in providing educational programs. Part I discusses the need for inservice training for local government officials, lists available education and training programs, points out major training gaps, and makes suggestions for strengthening such programs. Part II discusses progress and problems under the Iowa Community Services program and poses policy questions for the State Advisory Council, the administrators of the program, higher education officials, and community officials and leaders. Part III is a progress report on surveys and field work: it summarizes data on the personal and educational backgrounds of 1,600 persons in advisory and managerial positions and presents their views regarding their inservice training needs. The 1969 plans of the Institute of Public Affairs are also outlined. (nl)

ED0 32475

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ipa

Local Government Training Programs, Problems, and Needs in Iowa

---

A Three-Part Series

I. In-Service Training for Local Government Officials and Employees in Iowa

II. The Role of Title I in Providing Educational Programs for Iowa Communities

III. Progress Report: Development of Iowa Plan for In-Service Education in Local Government Management

by Clayton Ringgenberg

Institute of Public Affairs
The University of Iowa/Summer, 1968

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS, PROBLEMS, AND NEEDS IN IOWA

* * * * *

A Three-Part Series

I. In-Service Training for Local Government Officials and Employees in Iowa

II. The Role of Title I in Providing Educational Programs for Iowa Communities

III. Progress Report: Development of Iowa Plan for In-Service Education in Local Government Management

by

Clayton Ringgenberg

Institute of Public Affairs
The University of Iowa
Summer, 1968

The printing of this report has been financed in part through a grant from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development under Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended.

FOREWORD

This three-part report was prepared by the Institute as a result of surveys made during the past year relating to training for local government personnel and community leaders. These surveys were made at the request of the State Advisory Council for the Iowa Community Services program, which is authorized under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The State Advisory Council requested these surveys in order to provide guidelines for its decisions relating to Title I plans and projects and to provide information and suggestions which would encourage increased coordination of all training programs for local government personnel and civic leaders.

Part I of this report discusses the general need for in-service training in city and county government, lists the education and training programs now available, points out major training gaps, and makes suggestions for strengthening education and training programs for local government in Iowa.

Part II of the report discusses progress and problems under the Iowa Community Services program and poses policy questions for the State Advisory Council, the administrators of the program, higher education officials, and community officials and leaders. It also offers suggestions for possible emphasis under Title I, particularly for in-service education and training programs for local government officials.

Part III is a progress report on the surveys and field work done to begin the development of the in-service education program in local government management. It is highlighted by information obtained by the Institute from a questionnaire survey of 1,600 persons in supervisory and managerial positions in Iowa county and city governments. The report summarizes the data on the personal and educational backgrounds of these persons and presents their views regarding their in-service training needs. Then it outlines the steps the Institute plans to take this coming year in developing the in-service education program in local government management in cooperation with local government associations and officials and various educational institutions.

Dean Zenor, Director
Institute of Public Affairs

* * * * *

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through a grant from Iowa Community Services under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

CONTENTS

Page

PART I. IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES IN IOWA

SIZING UP THE SITUATION

A Nation-wide Concern 1
The Iowa Local Government Situation 1
Local Government Employment in Iowa 2
Purposes of This Report 4

THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING CONCEPT

Types of Training 6
Objectives of Training 8

IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN IOWA TODAY

Sources of Information 10
Agencies that Provide Training in Iowa 11
General Observations about Existing Programs 13
  Number of Programs 13
  Perspective of Training 14
  Responsibility for Training 14
  Short Courses and Workshops Predominate 15
  Abundance of Conferences 16
  Training Largely Job Skills Oriented 16
  Materials and Manpower for Teaching 16
  New Ways of Teaching 17

TRAINING GAPS AND PROBLEMS

Identifying Training Needs and Gaps 18
Evaluation of Kinds of Training 19
  Orientation Training 19
  Job Skills Training 19
  General Education Beyond the High School 21
  Management Training 22
  Mid-career Training 23
  General Public Policy Training 24

Page

Advisory and Technical Services 25
Training Outside Iowa 26
Other Gaps in In-Service Training 26
Pre-Service Training 28
Some Problems 29

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN IOWA 32

PART II. THE ROLE OF TITLE I IN PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR IOWA COMMUNITIES

THE CHALLENGES 37

THE BACKGROUND

The Advent of Title I 40
Title I Plan in Iowa 41
Purpose of This Part of the Report 41
Review of Training Needs in Iowa 42

THE PROGRAMS

Projects Authorized Under the State Plan 44
Accomplishments 44
Analysis of Projects 45
Kinds 45
Continuing Programs 45
Topics 45
Audiences 46
Program Development 47

THE PROBLEMS

What Is the Real Intent of Title I? 48
Community Problems 49
Other Types of Problems Under Title I 50
Project Orientation versus Problem Orientation 50
The State-wide Approach 51
The Role of Higher Education 52
Summary 52

POLICY QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Policies 54
Suggestions 55

Page

PART III. PROGRESS REPORT: DEVELOPMENT OF IOWA PLAN FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

INTRODUCTION 57

NEED FOR MANAGEMENT TRAINING 58

SURVEY OF MANAGERIAL AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

- Survey Method 61
- Responses to the Questionnaire 61
- Personal Backgrounds and Experience 63
  - Age 63
  - Education 63
  - Work Experience 64
- Willingness for Additional Training 66
- Kinds of Courses Preferred 67
- Abilities Required for Position 67

MANAGERIAL AND SUPERVISORY TRAINING NOW AVAILABLE . . 68

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEYS 69

PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM

- What the Plan Will Include 70
- The Plan of Action 71

APPENDIX A. LISTING OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN IOWA

- General Government 73
- Assessment of Property 74
- Finances and Records 75
- Fire 77
- Health 78
- Library 80
- Parks 81
- Planning, Housing, and Urban Renewal 82
- Police 84
- Public Works (Except for Utilities) 85
- Water, Sewer, and Other Utilities 88
- Welfare. 90

Page

Managerial and Supervisory--By Iowa Agencies 92
Managerial and Superivosry--By Other Agencies 99

Courses of Area Schools of Interest to City and County Government Officials and Employees
--Adult Education Courses 102
--Vocational and Technical Education Courses 104
--Liberal Arts and Science Courses 105

APPENDIX B. TABLES FROM SURVEY OF MANAGERIAL AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

TABLE 1. Departments of City and County Officials in Iowa Who Responded to Training Needs Survey 107

TABLE 2. Positions of City and County Officials in Iowa Who Responded to Training Needs Survey 108

TABLE 3. Ages of City and County Officials Who Responded to the Training Needs Survey 109

TABLE 4. Formal Education Completed by City and County Officials Who Responded to the Training Needs Survey 110

TABLE 5. Willingness to Enroll in Courses or Series of Courses by City and County Officials Who Responded to the Training Needs Survey 111

TABLE 6. In-Service Training Courses Preferred for Persons in Their Positions According to Responses of City and County Officials Who Responded to Training Needs Survey 112

TABLE 7. In-Service Training Courses Preferred for Persons in Their Positions According to Responses of City and County Officials Who Responded to Training Needs Survey by Type of Position 113

TABLE 8. Abilities and Skills that City Officials Who Responded to the Training Needs Survey Feel are Most Important for the Position They Hold by Type of Position 114

Page

TABLE 9. Abilities and Skills that County Officials Who Responded to the Training Needs Survey Feel Are Most Important for the Position They Hold by Type of Position 115

PART I. IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES IN IOWA

SIZING UP THE SITUATION

A Nation-wide Concern

Much has been written nation-wide to document the manpower shortage which exists in state and local government and which threatens to get worse during the next decade.[1]

What this shortage means in terms of stiffer competition for attracting and keeping capable people in state and local government is fairly evident. Not so evident, it seems, is the probability of need for greatly increased in-service training. If the manpower squeeze occurs, state and local governments will need to train, broaden, and upgrade existing employees and improve the utilization of them.

Aside from the manpower squeeze, the changing roles of state and local governments and the impact of technological changes on them will force these governmental units to find ways to update and upgrade their personnel. In other words, they will have to find ways to make the best use of what they have, find ways, too, to train existing personnel for new and more responsible roles.

Training persons on the job is one major way of upgrading and updating employees, particularly for persons in administrative, technical, and professional positions, where the needs and changes apparently are the greatest.

The Iowa Local Government Situation

Is this nation-wide picture true for city, town, and county governments in Iowa? The national surveys have not furnished detailed state-by-state data; rather they have provided gross information based on nation-wide trends in state and local government employment generally and in metropolitan governments particularly.

---

1. Two reports that have received widespread attention are Governmental Manpower for Tomorrow's Cities, Report of the Municipal Manpower Commission (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962); and Manpower in State and Local Governments, 1965 and 1975, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Moreover, little information is available about the manpower situation in city and county governments of the size which predominates in Iowa. No one really knows, therefore, whether the nation-wide analyses and conclusions apply equally to Iowa. Probably they do not. Here is why. First, by comparison with the nation as a whole, Iowa has relatively few metropolitan areas and medium-sized cities where the employment changes largely are occurring. Second, Iowa has many more small communities where local government does not require the special knowledges and skills needed in larger units. And third, county governments in Iowa largely are rurally-oriented and the kinds and numbers of employment are relatively stable. The nation-wide figures, furthermore, include state government employment and education employment which involve, for the most part, different types of personnel from the typical Iowa city or county government.

But although the nation-wide situation may not be fully applicable to Iowa, certainly the trends in state and local government employment and their implications for recruitment and upgrading of city and county personnel will have a significant impact on Iowa. Professional people and technicians in certain fields will be in demand. The competition for these persons, in both the private and public sectors, crosses state lines, and indications are that local governments are already at the low end of the totem pole in recruiting these persons. Secondly, the rapid advances of technology will result in new ways of doing the jobs of local government in Iowa, resulting in shifts of manpower within local government and necessitating in-service training not only for the persons doing the jobs but also for those who are supervising them. Finally, as Iowa becomes more and more urbanized, local governments will need to recruit and train staff to provide expanded services for a greater number of people and to deal with the social and other complex problems of a more urban society.

Local Government Employment in Iowa

What is the local government employment picture in Iowa? How many county and city employees are there? How many are in the various kinds of positions? What are the employment trends in these positions? Answers to these questions provide a starting point for considering training needs.

Unfortunately, information about local government employment in Iowa is rather scarce. The best source of information is the Bureau of Census report of local government employment, which shows total employment and the number of persons employed in the major functional areas (police, fire, welfare, etc.)[2] This information is given for counties as a group and for cities and towns as a group.

---

[2] Census of Governments: Government in Iowa, 1957 and 1962; and Public Employment in 1967, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

The census is made every five years. For 1967 only total figures are available; therefore estimates were made for the number employed in each major functional area based on 1962 and 1957 figures plus other sources of information.[3] These figures indicate the following employment picture. (The following figures are expressed in terms of the number of full-time equivalent employees, which takes into account part-time as well as full-time employees through a formula developed by the U. S. Census Bureau. This factor results in figures generally 5 to 10 per cent larger than the actual full-time numbers.)

1. The total number of Iowa local government employees is about 30,000.

	1957	1962	1967
Municipal government	11,300	13,750	16,500
County government	11,800	12,600	13,500
Total	23,100	26,350	30,000

2. The growth in the number of local government employees in Iowa for the past ten years (about 30 per cent) was less than the 50 per cent rate of growth of state and local government employment (not counting education employees) nation-wide. The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in its report Manpower in State and Local Government, 1965 and 1975, estimates that about the same rate of growth nation-wide will continue for the next ten years. If Iowa's rate continues to be proportionately smaller, this would mean an increase of 9,000 employees in the period 1967-1977.

3. Municipal employment has risen an estimated 45 per cent during the last decade, while county government employment has risen about 15 per cent. The larger increase in cities reflects the increases in urban population and in the kinds and levels of services in the cities.

4. In municipalities, most persons are employed to provide the following services (the numbers of employees listed are 1967 estimates): police (2,600), streets (2,250), fire (2,100), water and electric utilities (2,000), sewerage and sanitation (1,850), parks and recreation (1,000), general administration and staff functions (1,500), hospitals (650), and libraries (500).

5. In county governments, most persons are employed in these services: roads (4,600), general administration and staff functions (3,000), hospitals (2,900), public welfare (1,200), and public safety (500).

---

[3] Salary surveys of city and county governments made by the Institute of Public Affairs and the directories of city and county officials.

6. Iowa has a large number of elective officials. In round numbers there are an estimated 950 mayors, 5,000 city and town councilmen, 350 county supervisors, and 600 other elected county officers. Most of the city and town elective officials are part time; there are probably less than fifty full timers. This fact and the fact that many elective officials in local government are "short-timers" because of the normal turnover in office are important considerations in planning training programs for these policy makers in city and county government. Planning also must take into account the many persons who serve part time on boards and commissions of cities and counties.

7. There are an estimated 3,500 to 3,900 persons in management and supervisory positions in municipal and county governments; they account for about one of every eight employees.

8. Not enough information is available to make estimates for the following groupings of positions: professional and technical, service workers (other than for policemen and firemen), clerical, operatives (mainly equipment operators and utility plant operators), and laborers. Furthermore, little information is available about the numbers employed in the individual job classifications within these major general classification groups.

Purposes of this Report

This study and report were made at the request of the State Advisory Council for the Iowa Community Services program. This program is financed in part by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under it, a state plan is prepared as a guide for funding educational projects of higher educational institutions relating to community needs. One of the major areas of community needs under the current state plan in Iowa is increased training for local government officials and employees.

The Title I educational programs are, of course, only a part of the total in-service education now available to local governments. Significant training programs existed before the advent of Title I. But with this new source of financing, interested parties have pointed out the need to stop and take a look at what is being done in local government in-service training, what the major unmet training needs appear to be, and what might be done to meet the needs by using existing and new training resources.

From the standpoint of the Title I program, the Advisory Council and the administrators of the program want to have information upon which they can base their decisions (1) so that the Title I programs will not duplicate existing programs, (2) so that Title I programs will be aimed at the areas of greatest training need appropriate for Title I financing, and (3) so that cooperation and coordination of the training agencies and continuity of training programs will be encouraged.

This report can be of value in at least two other ways: to inform top echelon officials in local government about available training resources their cities and counties can use, and to stimulate interest in training on the part of local government officials and employees.

Another development points up the necessity for this kind of report. The federal government has begun to help finance local government training in a significant way, and indications are that this financial assistance will be increased in the next five to ten years. Along with the Title I program, money has just been made available to finance local governmental training programs under Title VIII of the Housing Act, for training related to community development. Legislation is being considered in Congress which would make more funds available under a separate act.[4] A crucial point is that under all these programs a state-wide plan of training is required, and it will necessitate more and better information about local employment training needs and resources than has been available.

---

[4] This is known as the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1967 (Senate 699).

THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING CONCEPT

Consideration of training needs, to the extent that city and county governments in Iowa give attention to training, is largely on an individualized departmental (functional) basis. This is understandable because with the exception of a few kinds of specialized training, local units do not provide their own formalized training programs. Rather the programs are provided by outside groups, and the impetus for taking advantage of the training usually comes from individual department heads rather than from mayors, councilmen, or boards of supervisors.

This situation is likely to continue. But, when one starts to consider future training needs and programming on a city-wide or county-wide basis, let alone a state-wide basis, as is being done in this report, it is well to provide a broader view of in-service training than generally results when a functional, catch-as-catch-can view is taken.

What do we mean by in-service training? What forms does it take? How can it be made available? Why should a city or county give proper attention to its over-all training needs? What benefits are there? Answers to these questions should be of concern to top county and city officials and to the educational institutions and other groups that will be working with them to meet training needs. Therefore, it is well to discuss briefly these matters to provide a framework for the remainder of the report.

Types of Training

In-service training can be considered of two general types: informal and formal.

It may seem trite to discuss informal training, because it is likely to be taken for granted by some and not even be considered as in-service training by others. By informal training we are referring mainly to the teaching of employees on the job by their supervisors or other persons. Probably the great bulk of in-service training in local government occurs in this way, and this point needs to be recognized at the outset. In fact, it may be the only in-service training many employees receive. It is an essential part of in-service training.

One Iowa county official commented: "Learning is doing. This training under a competent department head is very essential and practical . . . for there is little outside of local government that qualifies a person for such employment . . ."

Yet, although this kind of training is considered to be crucial, how much attention is given to seeing to it that supervisors at all levels do think of this as one of their most important tasks? The concept of in-service training (employee development) can be bolstered or discouraged at this very point, depending on the supervisor's willingness and ability to provide informal learning experiences, which then lead to more formal types of training.

By formal training we are referring to structured training situations. There are various kinds of formal training, and they can be offered in a variety of ways. For the purposes of this report, the following categories of training are used:

1. Orientation training. This is training designed to orient new officials or employees to the work environment, the broad government environment, or the broad aspects of their specific jobs.

2. Job skills (basic and technical) training. This training is largely directed toward manual, motor, and mechanical skills or office work skills. It is primarily for clerical and service workers, operatives, and laborers, but it is becoming increasingly important for certain professional and technical positions, and in these instances involves skills that are more intellectual than manual. This training is generally available through short courses offered by professional organizations or educational institutions. It can also be obtained by work-study arrangements.

3. General education beyond the high school. This training aims at broadening the individual's horizon of thinking and feeling by conveying general knowledge and insights that do not bear a direct relationship to his specific job. It is usually taken on an individual basis and is available through adult education programs, courses of area colleges, and correspondence courses of colleges and universities.

4. Management and supervisory training. This training relates to various areas of management functions: administration, human relations, and policy making and conceptual skills. It can be provided at several levels: (a) for local government executives, (b) for middle management, (c) for first-line supervisors and foremen, (d) for management interns, and (e) for employees who are being groomed for supervisory positions.

5. Mid-career education. It usually involves a designated amount of

time away from the job to obtain a college degree, an advanced degree, or a specialized type of course or courses on the condition that the person will return to his former place of employment.

6. General public policy training. This type might also be called public leadership training. It involves education which helps community officials better understand issues and change, provides guides for them to use in analyzing and solving community problems, and gives them an understanding of methods of developing community support for putting programs into action and of checking results. This type of education can also be directed at the private sector plus the many citizens who serve on various boards and commissions of city and county governments.

7. Advisory services and technical services. Although not generally considered to be training, these services to the smaller governmental units do result in learning experiences for the officials of these communities which they likely could not obtain in any other way.

Objectives of Training

In-service training can and should be beneficial not only to the individual who receives the training, but also to the local government. It should upgrade performance and the image of the public service.

In its report on in-service municipal training,[5] the International City Managers' Association pinpointed these goals of training from the individual's standpoint:

--To equip him with the skills he needs to perform more effectively the duties of his position.

--To attune him to the tasks he is called upon to perform in a changing world and to adjust his outlook and methods to new needs and demands.

--To instill in him an awareness of the relation of his work to the service rendered by his department and government.

--To prepare him for other duties (his next job), and when appropriate, develop his capacity for higher work and greater responsibilities (for a different job).

--To broaden his outlook.

---

[5] International City Managers' Association, "A Report on the In-Service Training Programs for Key Personnel," 1961.

Each of these benefits to the individual is in turn indirectly beneficial to the local government. More specifically, the objectives for the county or city government are:

1. Better job performance, which improves production and the image of the city or county.

2. Development of persons from within the ranks to take on additional responsibilities as vacancies occur.

3. Longer tenure of properly motivated employees.

4. Improvement of the government's ability to fulfill its increasing and new roles because it has a better equipped staff.

One concluding point: if in-service training is going to be truly meaningful, truly worthwhile, it should afford the employee-student the opportunity to achieve some perceptible and attainable goal, for himself and for his employer.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN IOWA TODAY

A wide variety of formal educational opportunities is available to local governmental officials and employees in Iowa today. See Appendix A for a listing of the programs.

These programs had not been compiled previously, which is understandable because there has been little over-all attention given to in-service training for local governments in Iowa. Training has been developed on a functional, fragmented basis as is documented below and has been used by local governments largely on a haphazard basis.

Probably most of the training programs which are available are included in the listing, but it is by no means complete. This survey did not warrant an exhaustive search for every program.[6] As a matter of fact, a complete list would be extremely difficult to compile because of the large number of agencies which have had some kind of training, plus the fact that many programs do not continue from year to year, or they have been offered only once.

Sources of Information

The remainder of this report is an attempt to summarize and analyze a considerable body of fact, views, and opinions regarding training programs and needs for local governmental officials. The information presented reflects not only the author's knowledge and judgments from being involved in state and local government in Iowa for fifteen years; it also reflects considerable reading of the nation-wide literature relating to this problem and contacts with local government officials and educators in Iowa.

A major source of information was a questionnaire survey conducted by the Institute of Public Affairs early in 1968 of persons in managerial and supervisory positions in city and county governments in Iowa. It was conducted to obtain the following types of information from these persons: (1) their educational and experience levels, (2) their views concerning training they need and that their employees need, and (3) the types of managerial and supervisory training now available to them and their personnel. The information was collected primarily from the larger cities and counties, and the 1,600 who responded is equivalent to nearly one-half of the persons in managerial and supervisory positions in Iowa. This information is fairly representative of the backgrounds and views of these key local government officials and therefore is a prime source of data for this series of reports, a source which previously has not been available.

---

[6] The information was obtained from correspondence with and reports of state and national associations of local government officials, from educational institutions, from questionnaires filled in by local government managerial and supervisory personnel, and other sources.

Other sources include:

--Manpower and training needs reports by national associations such as the International City Managers' Association, the Public Personnel Association, and the National League of Cities.

--Discussions and correspondence with officers of associations of public officials in Iowa and nation-wide.

--Report of the Iowa Community Services Conference, November 28, 1967.

--Survey of Iowa community problems and needs made by the Local Government Programs office of Iowa State University. ("Problems of Local Government in Iowa," February 14, 1968).

--Two conferences sponsored by the Institute of Public Affairs for city and county officials to discuss training needs (August 19, 1966, and March 22, 1967).

--Reports from other states and universities on public personnel development programs.

--Discussions with state officials and educators who have been responsible for developing educational programs for local governmental officials in Iowa.

Agencies that Provide Training in Iowa

As indicated above, quite a few kinds of agencies provide in-service training opportunities to Iowa local governments in addition to the training the cities and counties provide for their own employees. These agencies are:

--The state associations of city or county officials, department heads, and employees, which sponsor conferences and workshops.

--National associations of public officials, which sponsor national and regional conferences and workshops and have ready-made courses which can be taken by correspondence or by group instruction within a governmental unit.

--The three state universities, which sponsor conferences and offer short courses and correspondence courses, largely through their extension services.

--The fifteen public area schools, which have adult education courses and vocational-technical classes and programs as well as arts and science courses, which local governmental personnel can attend. Private two-year and four-year colleges also make some of their courses available.

--Several state government agencies that provide in-service training in which local governmental employees participate. Examples are the Department of Social Services (welfare training) and the State Highway Commission (public works training).

--Suppliers of office equipment, public works machinery, etc., which provide training for public employees who will be using this equipment.

--Private companies which have short courses adaptable to local governmental training needs.

--A few federal government agencies (the U.S. Public Health Service, for example) that have programs in which local officials and employees participate.

The role of the federal government should be emphasized as a training resource, not only for what it is now doing but also because of what seems to be coming in the near future. To supplement the training programs of the agencies, the U.S. Civil Service Commission has developed a wide range of in-service training programs for federal employees. Although local officials are not eligible to participate in these programs now, under proposed federal legislation they would be able to participate in training programs of the Commission or of certain federal agencies.

Congress recently has provided money to states to assist with local governmental training. Under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, money is granted to universities and colleges to provide educational programs for local governmental officials and employees aimed at dealing with community problems. In 1968, money was granted under the Housing Act of 1964 (Title VIII) for training programs to upgrade local governmental personnel involved in community development and renewal. Under Title IX of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 money has been made available which can be used in part to provide technical field services and information to local units of government. And lastly, money is available under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 which can be used in part for training of persons who are employed to upgrade them for advancement. These opportunities apply to public as well as private employment, although the emphasis is on private.

General Observations about Existing Programs

The major strengths and gaps in the kinds of training and some of the apparent problems in providing in-service training for local governmental officials and employees will be discussed in the next chapter. Some general observations about existing programs need to be made now, however, to give the reader a better, broader understanding of the situation.

Number of Programs. A first reaction to an examination of the programs listed in Appendix A is that there is a large number of in-service programs available. This is certainly true; there is a wide variety of programs, and the number is on the increase. However, the number of them may be more impressive than the coverage of them, for several reasons.

It must be remembered that these programs must serve the in-service training needs of some 30,000 county and city officials and employees in close to 100 different jobs. Furthermore, there is very little preservice education for local government employment, and this lack compounds the need for in-service training. Turnover in local government employment also contributes to the need.

In addition, the short-term character of in-service training programs requires that there be more of them than if they were longer-range, more intensified courses. Most in-service programs are of the one- to three-day short course or conference type. A few may last as long as a week; only rarely are they regular length high school or college courses.

A significant portion of the in-service programs are "short-term" in another sense. That is, they are available on a one-shot basis, or sometimes, on an irregular basis. In other words, they are not offered year after year. This is another reason that there is an impressive number of courses in the listing.

One last point: although information is not available about the number who have attended these programs, it is evident that the major programs with any depth to them are the short courses, and generally in order to provide the preferred teaching-learning situations, enrollments for these courses are limited, usually to thirty students or fewer. This limitation, too, contributes to the large number of in-service training programs.

All in all, the individualistic, functional approach to in-service training has resulted in a large number of courses, and also a proliferation of them.

Perspective of Training. As was pointed out earlier in this report, adequate in-service training programs are essential if Iowa local governments are going to keep pace with the rapid changes in our society, meet the competition of other types of employment, and enable their officials and employees to upgrade themselves.

Training is important, but in discussing the Iowa programs, in-service training must be kept in proper perspective so that it is not considered a cure-all or an end in itself. Training can be truly successful only if it is combined with other good personnel practices; it cannot replace them.

It has to be combined with adequate salaries, possibilities for promotion to greater responsibilities, job achievement and recognition, and adequate retirement and other fringe benefits.

It has to be combined with a good image of employment in the public service.

It has to be combined with aggressive recruitment practices, including encouragement of pre-service education that will help steer young adults to public service.

It has to be combined with recognition of the increasing professional nature of many positions in local government.

In-service training is stronger and is more likely to grow in a climate of these good personnel practices than when inadequate attention is given to these matters by legislative bodies and top administrators.

It is not the purpose of this report to evaluate this "climate" in Iowa. However, it might be well for local units of government in Iowa to examine their current personnel practices, individually and collectively, to see whether there are shortcomings in these practices which may hinder the benefits of existing or new in-service training programs.

Responsibility for Training. Very little formal training is carried on by Iowa local governmental units themselves. Except for police and fire training, what they do is a minor part of the over-all picture of formal in-service training.

Because these governmental units are relatively small and because only a few have well-developed personnel systems, it is easy to understand why they cannot do their own training. Instead, what has happened, in large part, is that through their state and national associations, local governmental officials and employees in the various professional and occupational groups have established training programs for their particular function or job. Usually these programs are offered on a state-wide basis, and sometimes regionally, but they are rarely offered on a city-by-city or county-by-county basis.

Oftentimes, educational institutions have been requested to do the teaching or programming for these groups, but more recently, educational institutions have either developed special conferences, institutes, courses, etc., for local governmental personnel or have made special efforts to encourage these persons to take advantage of regular course offerings. The latter has been accomplished primarily through university correspondence, extension, or short courses, and high school adult education courses.

All of this means that although local units of government may help initiate in-service training programs, they do not have direct control of them; nor do they necessarily have to feel responsible for them. When a program is offered for a particular city or county, attendance is predictable. This is not true, of course, when a program is offered on a regional or state-wide basis; then it is optional whether a city or county has participants in it. Persons in charge of developing the programs, consequently, tend to choose programs for which there has been demonstrated interest or for which they can receive state association support. This situation discourages innovative programming.

Because mayors, councilmen, and county supervisors are not usually involved in developing the programs, they must depend upon their department heads and others to keep abreast of in-service training opportunities and to encourage attendance. They also must be willing to give financial support to these programs away from home: support in terms of travel expenditures, living costs, and sometimes tuition. To what extent these costs are a problem is not known. On the whole, it appears that the larger governmental units have been quite willing to participate in and support programs, while the smaller governmental units have not.

Finally, this situation means that programming usually must be geared to broad educational needs, rather than to the needs of an individual city or county which makes it difficult for it to appraise the suitability and evaluate the effectiveness of any particular program for its personnel.

Short Courses and Workshops Predominate. The predominant type of formal in-service education available is the short course-workshop type, which is aimed almost exclusively at upgrading job skills. It is popular and practical, because the participants can take advantage of the program and yet be away from their jobs for a relatively short period of time. Also, this type of training permits more persons to attend over a span of years than would be the case if courses were of significantly longer duration.

Generally, these short courses and workshops are well established; many are repeated at least annually.

Abundance of Conferences. There is an abundance (some claim an overabundance) of meetings and conferences for local governmental officials and employees. These meetings are touched upon here to acknowledge them as an in-service training factor which involves the time of a considerable number of top local officials in any one year.

Conferences and meetings are a way of life for local public officials today. In addition to local meetings, they are expected to attend district and state, and sometimes national, meetings and conferences to keep abreast of governmental changes and issues. Most conferences are of one or two types, either (1) get-togethers of particular professional or occupational groups (association meetings) to exchange ideas and techniques and to promote the purposes of the group, or (2) public policy conferences, mostly for the upper echelons of policy-making and administrative officials to discuss problems and issues of local government.

As noted above, these are largely state association meetings, with the groups meeting at least once, but sometimes more often, each year. In recent years, colleges and universities have sponsored an increasing number of conferences; for the most part, these conferences have supplemented rather than replaced association-type meetings.

With few exceptions, conferences are not included in the listing of in-service programs in Appendix A because of the large number of them and the fact that the program content is often general.

Training Largely Job Skills Oriented. Training opportunities tend to be largely those that directly relate to specific work functions and skills while training programs in leadership, problem solving, conceptual skills, public relations, and the like are relatively few. Furthermore, the job skills types of courses have continuity in the sense that many are repeated annually, or more often, while generally the training programs in other categories are offered only once, or sporadically. This lack of continuity is true, for example, of most of the supervisory and management training courses available from Iowa agencies.

Materials and Manpower for Teaching. As was noted earlier, in-service training for local government is a different type of education from the traditional classroom type. Subject matter usually is concentrated and specialized, and the materials are geared to an adult education type of teaching. Therefore, "teachers" with specialized backgrounds, rather than regular teachers, often are used.

There is no way of knowing the adequacy of teaching manpower for existing in-service training programs, short of an analysis of each kind of program. Discussions with local government officials and educators, however, indicate that:

1. A shortage of qualified persons to teach has forestalled some additional training.

2. There is a shortage of persons to teach in-depth courses to local governmental officials.

Development of new and better materials is a constant need. There is a wide variety of material for certain kinds of local government training, but this material should be constantly updated. In updating old materials and in preparing materials for new courses, educators and local governmental officials need to be aware of courses offered in other states, or by business, which could be used or adapted for use in Iowa. The considerable increase in in-service training nation-wide has resulted in the development of large amounts of materials and courses which Iowans should take advantage of to avoid duplication of effort.

New Ways of Teaching. Apparently most in-service training is taught by using customary teaching techniques: lectures, class discussion, correspondence lessons, etc. Although case studies and audiovisual materials sometimes are used, the newer teaching methods of problem-solving techniques, simulation exercises, and role playing rarely are used.

Perhaps an even more critical point is that very little consideration is being given to teaching and learning aids such as educational television and programmed learning, both of which enable the student to learn without having to spend time traveling to the place of instruction. From the standpoint of the instructor, use of these kinds of communication devices can save his time, too, and a much larger audience can be reached. Since there may be a shortage of knowledgeable persons to teach local governmental personnel, these new devices could prove to be of considerable benefit, particularly in reaching those who cannot take existing courses because of time or expense involved and in reaching relatively large numbers where necessary.

TRAINING GAPS AND PROBLEMS

The purpose of this chapter is to identify gaps in local governmental training in Iowa, that is, to point out categories in which there seems to be a need for training that is not being met, either because existing programs are not adequate or because no program now exists. In addition, problems connected with providing in-service training locally in Iowa are discussed. Then the final chapter of the report contains suggestions for what might be done to improve in-service local government training.

Identifying Training Needs and Gaps

It is hard to pinpoint these gaps for a number of reasons: the magnitude of the situation (the state-wide picture involves 30,000 local officials and employees), the variety of training needs, and the maze of existing programs. Furthermore, the determination of training needs, which in turn helps uncover training gaps, is largely a subjective process. It depends considerably on points of view concerning (1) which abilities, skills, and knowledge for each kind of job are necessary in the foreseeable future; (2) how qualified the persons now in the various jobs are, in terms of these abilities, skills, and knowledge; and (3) the adequacy of existing training programs, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, in satisfying these needs.

Realistically, then, it must be emphasized that any survey of this type has these limitations which, though not severe, are significant and must be taken into account by the reader. The conclusions, of necessity, are based as much on the author's views and impressions as they are on statistical fact.

It must be emphasized, too, that this is not an in-depth analysis of the training programs for individual positions or occupations. Within the limits of time and resources available for this study, only a surface examination could be made of most programs. Actually, if in-depth studies are made, they probably will be most effective if they are done on a function-by-function basis with direct involvement of persons familiar with each particular local function.

Despite the limitations named above, the information assembled in this survey provides for the first time an over-all perspective of the Iowa situation and provides a better basis for making judgments than has previously been available. Thus the observations made in the preceding chapter are good starting points for considering needs and gaps. Comments will be made in the following pages about the adequacy of the kinds of training as they are classified in Chapter II of this report. Those comments will be followed by a discussion of apparent specific gaps in training.

Evaluation of Kinds of Training

1. Orientation training. Newly elected officials in municipal and county governments have the opportunity to attend some kind of orientation meeting shortly after they take office. The state universities, in cooperation with the League of Iowa Municipalities, sponsor one-day (or several evening) sessions for new mayors and councilmen. Incumbent county officials of the various offices provide regional one-day schools for newly elected county officers.

These orientation sessions are fine as far as they go, but they are rather limited in time and scope. Time permits little more than a briefing. These meetings, for the most part, deal with procedures, which are certainly important for new officials to understand. But because of lack of time, little attention is given more substantive matters that new officials face: intra-governmental and inter-governmental relationships, public relations, policy issues, community development, and the like.

Not much is known about orientation of other local governmental employees, which would include job orientation, briefing on the remainder of the city or county operation, and instruction on good relations with the public. This kind of orientation, of course, should be an individual city or county responsibility.

Some association-type meetings are aimed, at least in part, at the newcomer, but these meetings primarily are for those at the department head or professional level, or their assistants.

New policemen and firemen receive orientation training as part of their rookie training, either from their city or from special schools for new recruits. Additional training of this type for new policemen is being made available by the state law enforcement academy established by the 1967 Iowa General Assembly.

Formal orientation sessions are a regular part of the training program of the State Department of Social Services for all county public welfare personnel. These orientation programs for public safety and welfare personnel stand out, for the typical city or county employee does not receive this kind of formal training as part of his introduction to his job.

2. Job skills training. Considerable emphasis is now being given to

job skills training. As noted earlier, short courses predominate as the method of training, and most of this training is directed at upgrading job skills. This emphasis is not surprising, because the bulk of employment in local government is in positions where clerical, mechanical, or technical job skills are necessary. Also, skills in much governmental employment are either unique or quite different from other employment and necessitate this kind of training for new employees.

There is evidence that more of this type of training still is considered to be the major need of local government in the eyes of those who are in supervisory capacities. When asked in the questionnaire referred to earlier in this report to indicate what additional kinds of training programs are needed for persons they supervise, persons in managerial and supervisory positions in both municipal and county governments indicated an almost two to one preference for technical (how-to-do-it) training for their employees over any other kind. Other kinds listed in the questionnaire, in order of preference, were:

--On-the-job training (machine operating or equipment handling, etc.).

--Management and supervisory courses.

--General education courses (high school or college level).

These same managers and supervisors indicated that the ability or skill they considered most important for persons working for them is the person's technical skill for work in the department. It was considered much more important than ability to get along with people or supervisory skills, which were ranked second and third. Abilities and skills that were considered relatively unimportant for their employees, according to the rankings, were: general knowledge of governmental operations, general public administration, and office management skills.

There seems to be considerable on-the-job skill training for the following types of positions and occupations:

1. Policemen
2. Firemen
3. Sewer and waterworks operators
4. Parks and golf course maintenance personnel
5. Welfare directors and case workers
6. Library personnel
7. Milk and other food sanitarians
8. Sub-professionals (inspectors, surveyors, rod men, etc.) in county road departments and city street departments
9. Assessors and their deputies
10. Electric and gas utility personnel

In other areas of local government operation, the availability of job skills training appears to be much less. There does not seem to be much in-service education for office-type employees (clerks, typists, stenographers, and machine operators). It may be that because of the pre-governmental training and experience of these employees, formal job skill training is not desired. Or it may be that there is little incentive because of lack of advancement opportunities. Or it may be that these persons, on their own time and money, are taking adult education courses in high schools or area schools to upgrade their office skills. Closely related is the apparent lack of training in office management procedures. This situation is surprising in view of the large number of local government agencies which require the services of a person with office management skills.

Another skills area in which there seems to be a minimum of in-service training is finance--accounting, purchasing, budgeting, and public finance generally.

From the survey of managers and supervisors, there was some indication that it is not possible for counties and cities to give much on-the-job training to their road and street maintenance personnel.

Other categories of personnel about which there is reasonable question as to the adequacy of existing job skills training are: all kinds of building inspectors, zoning and planning administrators (smaller cities), recreational personnel (particularly for those who are part time), maintenance personnel of sewer and water departments, and sub-professionals in planning and urban renewal offices. Although there is not a great deal of data processing and computer training available, this lack may be attributed to the fact that so few local governments in Iowa have electronic data processing facilities.

Of particular note regarding job skills training are the instances where training is almost essential to continued public employment or advancement. Sewer and water plant operators must be certified, and the subject matter of the test they must pass to be certified is related closely to the short courses offered by The University of Iowa and Iowa State University for such personnel. Likewise, new policemen must receive certain basic training within a certain period after being employed. In-service training is considered essential to advancement in the professional development program for persons in public welfare positions. Looking ahead, it seems that an increasing number of local governmental occupations may be tied to certification or advancement programs which require job skills or other types of training.

3. General education beyond the high school. Quite a few general education courses that would seem to be useful to local government personnel are available either through adult education classes at high schools or area schools (community colleges) or through credit extension courses of the three state universities. These extension courses are offered by

correspondence and in some instances, off-campus courses are provided. Most of these courses have not been geared to any particular work group, public or private; rather they have been offered to the public in general.

There is little evidence that public officials and employees are taking advantage of work-related general education courses that are available to them. The reasons for this are not clear. There may be a lack of interest because local government personnel do not believe the courses are applicable or beneficial, or it may be that educators have not made it a special point to encourage public officials and employees to enroll.

In the survey of city and county managerial and supervisory personnel, the 1,600 who answered the questionnaire were asked to indicate the courses they would like to see provided for persons in their positions. Of fourteen possible choices, human relations and psychology received highest preference, while public speaking and writing was sixth. So interest in these two general education areas is quite evident. Other courses which received high ranking were, in order of preference:

2nd Supervisory practices in public management
3rd Personnel administration
4th Governmental public relations and communications
5th Management planning
7th General public administration
8th Public law
9th Public works administration

Courses in American government, office management, finance administration, data processing, and urbanization were of relatively little interest to these managers and supervisors.

4. Management training. Opportunities for local officials to obtain managerial and supervisory training are spotty in Iowa.

The three state universities and Drake University primarily, plus a few other agencies, have provided a variety of programs for this kind of in-service training, but there is little continuity to the programs, and a minimum of coordination among the agencies which offer them. Furthermore, almost without exception, these are one-shot courses in the sense that there is no sequence of courses; rather each course offered stands by itself.

The courses are usually one of three types: (1) short course of two to five consecutive days; (2) short course in which classes are held one day per week for several hours for eight to twelve weeks; (3) correspondence courses. For the most part, the short courses are not held on a regular basis. Exceptions are the courses for police command officers, fire command officers, and nursing supervisors which are held annually and for welfare directors and supervisors which are held several times a year. The correspondence courses are offered periodically, some annually and some every few years.

Most of these courses seem to be for city department heads and deal primarily with management techniques, although there are a few courses on human relations, leadership, and communications. Key persons in city and county government and officials in state associations frequently have commented in discussions that top officials in local government, through conferences and meetings and their previous experience, have ample opportunity to gain perspective of governmental and management affairs, but middle managers and first-line supervisors have little or no opportunity for in-service training to learn supervisory and management skills and to gain a broader perspective of the operation of government. The comment has also been made that recruitment of existing personnel for supervisory positions would be aided by more in-service educational opportunities that would help equip these persons to assume supervisory responsibilities.

There seems to be considerable interest in this kind of training on the part of the city and county managerial and supervisory personnel. Responding to the Institute's questionnaire referred to earlier in this report:

--Nearly 70 per cent said that they would enroll in courses if they were offered at night at a nearby college or community college.

--Almost 60 per cent said that they would be willing to enroll in non-credit courses at one of the state universities.

--Slightly less than one-half said that they would be willing to take a series of courses, two per year for three years, leading to a certificate (nondegree program) in government management.

In addition, as noted above, these persons indicated a preference for courses relating directly to supervision and human relations, with courses in psychology (human relations), supervisory practices, and personnel administration ranked 1, 2, 3 in that order.

For more detailed information, see Part III of this series of reports.

Apparently there are few senior executive type courses or seminars available to top local officials: mayors, county supervisors, city managers, and department heads in larger cities. Such training would involve sessions in leadership, decision making, and utilization of modern management systems and techniques.

5. Mid-career training. The only program found which lends direct

encouragement to mid-career training is that of the State Department of Social Services. Local welfare personnel are eligible to receive education leave to obtain advanced degrees. Persons who will receive leave are selected according to criteria and quotas. They receive a set amount of education leave pay and retain their positions and benefits when they return, at which time they must serve for a period of time at least equal to the length of their leave. A part-time leave program also is available. It is for less than half-time study and allows the employee to retain his salary and benefits, but his work load is reduced during the time he is taking the special course work.

There probably are one or two other similar programs in Iowa, but mid-career training is almost nonexistent. The universities and colleges do, of course, have scholarship programs which are open to all who qualify, and occasionally scholarships are awarded to public officials who return to college for graduate work. The University of Iowa, for example, has a Master's degree program in municipal administration and another in urban and regional planning. Some participants in these programs have been persons who have interrupted their local government careers for further schooling.

6. General public policy training. Social problems, urbanization, community development, community renewal, planning, and intergovernmental relations: these are the areas of local governmental operation that are receiving increasing attention nation-wide. Correspondingly, there is the call for greatly stepped up in-service training in these subject areas for top echelon officials and professional staffs in local government.

In Iowa there is not much in the way of formal training opportunities on those subjects or in leadership training or problem solving. However, informally, there are many conferences and meetings which deal with these matters which top echelon local officials can attend.

No one really knows the degree of effectiveness of this informal type of learning experience. Certainly, these meetings and conferences are of value to mayors, councilmen, city managers, county supervisors, and department heads of larger city and county governments; but there is a feeling that the informal training needs to be fortified by concentrated, more in-depth types of formal training opportunities. This rationale is backed by recent federal government financial assistance to encourage higher educational institutions to provide more and better programs of this type of training. Title I of the Higher Education Act and Title VIII of the Housing Act apparently are both designed primarily for this purpose.

The difficulty in promoting public policy programs is that most of the persons for whom they would be designed already consider themselves to be "over-meetinged." This is particularly true for elective officials in cities, most of whom are part time. In addition, because local governments in Iowa are small and their concerns are largely "caretaker" in nature (street maintenance, police and fire protection, and the like), there is a real question about the extent of local interest in programs which would deal with social problems, rehabilitating cities, revitalizing neighborhoods, public housing, etc.

It can be argued that most Iowa communities have these problems in some degree, even in many of the smaller places, and that part of the formal educational process should be to help local officials and community leaders become better aware of the changes and problems in their communities and what the possible solutions may be. If this argument is valid, ways must be found to stimulate local officials' interest to a greater extent than now exists, perhaps by providing training opportunities that are more imaginative, meaningful, and directly applicable.

7. Advisory and technical services. Iowa is a state of many small towns and quite a few relatively small county governments. Many small towns have few, if any, full-time personnel, and in towns and counties the turnover of personnel is high. Therefore, many officials and employees lack adequate training and experience in governmental operations and need help and advice.

Probably the best way, under the circumstances, to assist these persons is for some agency to provide field technical and advisory services to them. Until recently, very little of this type of "training" has been available to the smaller units of government. Those who could get assistance got it primarily from neighboring communities and, to some extent, from state government agencies and associations, plus university extension services, largely through correspondence and information bulletins or publications.

Recently, several agencies have embarked upon programs to give increasing emphasis to field services for smaller units of government. The Local Government Programs office, which is part of University Extension at Iowa State University, is sponsoring regional meetings, usually held at night, on subjects primarily of interest to small towns. For example, that office has designed a simplified budget procedure for small communities and has held regional meetings to explain the system and how to use it effectively. These types of meetings are of immediate benefit, and they also provide an opportunity for local officials to know the staff of the Local Government Programs office so that they can subsequently turn to that staff for information and advice.

The League of Iowa Municipalities has traditionally provided information and advice to smaller communities. Because of a small staff, this service has been limited and has been done almost exclusively by correspondence. Under a grant made available under Title IX of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 the League plans to employ a full-time fieldman to provide technical services to cities and towns. The League will be assisted in this program by the Institute of Public Affairs at The University of Iowa and the Local Government Programs office, which will prepare manuals and bulletins to be used in providing the field services. This entire service is being coordinated by the State Office for Planning and Programming.

The extent to which these programs will be adequate to fill this obvious educational gap for local government in Iowa is yet to be seen. Certainly, significant steps are now underway to deal with a situation where field technical and advisory services were not adequate.

Pertinent to this matter is the fact that some states have created a state office of local government, which has as one of its functions the providing of these kinds of services to smaller communities and counties.

8. Training outside Iowa. Comment needs to be made about training opportunities available from agencies outside the state to Iowa local officials and employees. Those that Iowans are most likely to participate in are listed in Appendix A.

Information is not available to indicate the extent to which this training is used by Iowa local government personnel. In instances where courses have been offered in Iowa in cooperation with the national agencies, the response has been good, and some local officials have taken correspondence courses directly with these national agencies. Otherwise, probably few Iowans participate in these courses and seminars. On the other hand, it is quite common for mayors, city managers, city department heads, and some county officials to attend national professional or association meetings to keep abreast of developments in their fields.

The availability of these out-of-state educational opportunities should be a factor to consider in Iowa's planning of local in-service education, for it may well be that in certain specialized areas of need it would be wiser to take advantage of programs provided nation-wide or regionally rather than to establish a special program for Iowa.

Other Gaps in In-Service Training

The analyses in the preceding section point up many of the apparent gaps in training. In brief, these gaps point to the following needs for additional training:

1. Orientation sessions that are more substantive for newly elected county and city officials, including citizens who are members of various boards and commissions of local government.

2. More job skills training. There are probably enough kinds of programs for most positions and occupations, but they are not offered often enough for the number who need the training. However, there seems to be a lack of formal training in office management procedures, in job skills relating to financial procedures, and in job skills for public works maintenance persons, particularly in street and road departments.

3. Greatly expanded programs of supervisory and management training on a continuing basis, particularly for first-line supervisors and middle-level managers.

4. Senior executive type programs for top echelon administrative officials in cities and counties.

5. More attention to providing mid-career training opportunities.

6. More public policy and leadership training opportunities of a formal nature which are imaginative and directly applicable to community issues and problems, and which involve the private sector as well as public.

In addition to the above, there apparently are the following gaps in formal training:

1. Public relations. Top officials want to know more about how to enhance public understanding and appreciation of governmental affairs, to get support for projects, and to stimulate citizen involvement. Local officials also feel that they need assistance in providing public relations training for all their employees, to increase employee appreciation of the government they work for as well as to increase their effectiveness in contacts with the public. County officials emphasized this point in response to the Institute's questionnaire survey of local government managers and supervisors and in the author's conversations with individual county officers.

2. How-to-teach training. If in-service training is to be significantly stepped up, local governments themselves will have to provide some of the additional programs. There may be a reluctance to do this because of the lack of knowledge and experience about teaching techniques and methods on the part of local personnel who would do the teaching. There are hardly any "teach the teacher" programs available to local government personnel today, and this appears to be a training need that should be given some attention.

3. Work-study arrangements. Apparently there is very little training of this kind in local government. By contrast, businesses and industries have cooperative programs with high schools and area schools (vocational-technical) for persons still in school, for new employees, and for persons who are being upgraded.

4. Training for members of boards and commissions. Many citizens are serving their communities or counties as members of planning commissions, park boards, county conservation commissions, boards of review, civil service commissions, and the like. They are an important part of the system of local government, but they probably constitute an under-utilized resource for dealing with community problems. Surprisingly, there is hardly any on-going training for these persons, either to help them with their immediate responsibilities or to increase their understanding of governmental processes and community problems generally.

5. County government employees. There are comparatively few formal in-service training opportunities available for county government officials and employees, with the exception of public welfare personnel and professional and technical persons in county road departments. Although it is true that learning by doing is essential because of the specific procedures required in each county office, there would appear to be a need for formalized training that would, for example, give county personnel a better understanding of governmental operations, that would help them keep pace with developments in office management and record-handling procedures, and help improve their communications skills.

6. Labor relations. Not much training is available in personnel administration matters. Although courses relating to this subject logically should be considered as part of the management and supervisory training needs suggested above, the need for labor relations training is especially mentioned here because collective bargaining is becoming an increasingly important factor in local government, and programs to assist public officials in handling this role are minimal at present.

Finally, it should be stressed that there is an apparent need to help local governmental officials gain a broader and more long-range perspective of (1) the society we live in, particularly as to how urbanization has and will affect rural and urban Iowa, (2) the capabilities needed in decision making and managing today's modern local government, and (3) ways to deal with social problems. Government officials also need to be better posted about resource agencies available to local government and the methods of working with these agencies and the private sector of the community. In other words, more emphasis should be given to helping local governmental officials know more about the vital roles their city or county government can play, at present and in the future, as part of the community team.

Pre-Service Training

Although the main thrust of this report is concerned with in-service training for local government employment rather than pre-service training for it, a discussion of the former type would not be complete without mention of the latter.

Where do public officials and employees in local government come from? What kind of training do they receive for public employment? Where do they get it?

The answer, which is rather obvious and yet rather surprising (perhaps because the questions are rarely asked), is that there is very little high school or post high school education directed at a career in local government. The major exceptions are stenographic training and certain professional training in: civil engineering, public administration, planning, library, public welfare, and public health.

It is true, of course, that courses a person may take in high school or college, although not geared particularly to local government employment, may help qualify him for a job there. On the other hand, if government employment is significantly different from other types of employment, as is claimed, it is surprising that more educational programs are not geared in this direction. Furthermore, how much consideration is given to local government employment by high school or college counselors?

On the other hand, there is some indication that persons now in local government employment do not come directly from high school or college. In the Institute's questionnaire survey of some 1, 600 persons who are in managerial and supervisory positions in city and county governments, it was found that about 70 per cent of them worked for private business immediately before working for the city or the county. Whether this holds true for other occupations in local government employment is not known. If it does, one may conjecture that although the scant pre-service training may accentuate the need for in-service training, still business is actually providing some basic experience and training for most persons who later go into local government employment, and this may alleviate the need for certain types of specialized pre-service training and may lesson the need for in-service training. This is a matter which should be examined carefully by those who plan to start new training programs.

One other point needs to be made about pre-service training. Although no detailed analysis was made to find out the educational qualifications for the various positions and occupations in local government, a general impression is that a college degree is more than adequate, but that a high school diploma is not enough for certain positions. The point is that perhaps there is a need for one- or two-year post high school educational programs leading to certain kinds of employment in local government.

Some Problems

The preceding discussions of training needs and gaps has pinpointed some of the specific problems involved. Several other practical problems of more general applicability need to be highlighted.

Although there is a general willingness locally to support existing training, indications are that the top-level officials of many cities and counties are not really convinced of the value and need for in-service training.

Is this judgment wrong? It may be. However, how much attention is given to training by top officials of cities and counties? How much encouragement is given to supervisors and the rank-and-file personnel to seek out training opportunities and then to recognize and reward them for this?

How many cities and counties have taken a systematic look at their training needs and at what might be done about them? What kind of feedback do top officials receive from those persons who have attended programs in order to evaluate the usefulness of the programs in meeting training needs? What have individual cities and counties done to see what they can do to provide training programs for themselves? What have they done to take advantage of outside training assistance?

On the other side of the coin, there are problems these top officials face in considering training. It must be kept in mind that many of the elective officials are part time and that local governmental units in Iowa are relatively small in terms of numbers of employees. Therefore:

1. Many of the top officials do not have the time to give much attention to training themselves.

2. They do not have personnel departments or an individual in charge of personnel matters, which would include training.

3. They must depend on the heads of their operating departments; these heads may often be too busy with other matters to give training much consideration, or they may not be interested in training for themselves or their employees.

4. Where there are few employees, top officials seem to be reluctant to let employees, particularly key persons, attend training that lasts more than several days.

In addition, city officials cannot be blamed if they are somewhat uncertain about training opportunities for their personnel. There has been no easy way to determine what is available, because there has been no single clearinghouse for information about programs. The situation to them no doubt is confusing. Furthermore, since many courses are offered on a one-shot basis without continuity or sequence, local governmental officials cannot depend on them from one year to the next.

All of this bears on the central question of what can be done to make adequate in-service training opportunities readily available in a state like

Iowa where governmental units are fairly equally spread throughout a good-sized state (the travel problem), where governmental units are relatively small (creating the problems just noted), where many local officials are either part time or short term, or both, and where agencies providing in-service training to local governments are unrelated.

Some suggestions of what might be done are made in the next few pages.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN IOWA

1. That a clearinghouse for information about in-service training programs be established to serve local units of government in the following ways:

   a. Provide information about the availability of kinds of training programs.

   b. Provide information about plans for new programs.

   c. Prepare calendars of upcoming conferences and courses.

   d. Assist cities and counties in developing their own training programs.

An existing state agency or educational institution could serve as this clearinghouse center.

2. That a local governmental in-service training committee be established, comprised of city, county, and state officials; persons in education; and persons responsible for administering state-wide federally-assisted programs such as vocational education, Title I, Title VIII, and on-the-job training. Major responsibilities of this group could be:

   a. To encourage cooperative policies and programs and the upgrading of state and local government employment.

   b. To identify and analyze changing trends, needs, and problems affecting public service education and training.

   c. To develop and recommend imaginative and creative plans, programs, and techniques to improve the education and training of public employees.

   d. To encourage individual units of government to participate in these programs.

   e. To cooperate with and assist educational institutions in the development of more pre-service educational programs designed to help supply qualified persons for state and local governments.

In line with this suggestion, it is interesting to note that in Tennessee and California recent action was taken to establish an agency and committee, respectively, to move toward state-wide concern for and coordination of training.

3. That local governmental units each designate a person to check periodically the training needs of that particular governmental unit and the availability of training to fulfill those needs. That this be done, where possible, to the extent of planning training needs for a period of time for selected individual employees to aid with their career development.

4. That local governmental units each review their own potentials and local facilities for providing in-service training for themselves. That professional groups and educational institutions review their potentials and facilities for increasing their in-service training to local governments, particularly in areas where major gaps in training exist.

5. That local governments, individually and collectively, contact their area school (community college and vocational-technical school) to investigate possible in-service training programs for their personnel such as work-study programs, programs of study for persons in certain positions or occupations, and special single courses to meet their needs.

6. That representatives of local governments, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the area community colleges explore the possibility for one- or two-year post high school programs of study to prepare persons for general local government employment or for particular positions or occupations. This would be pre-service training, and in some instances, it might involve internships.

7. That in considering training resources, local governments take advantage of existing state or federal training programs whenever applicable and feasible. Likewise, state and federal agencies should encourage local governments to participate, particularly in professional, technical, and managerial training programs.

8. That local governmental units give increasing attention to providing incentives to their employees for in-service training: (a) released time for training; (b) payment or reimbursement of tuition; (c) promotion related to training; and (d) pay increases related to training.

9. That educational institutions and professional groups plan to provide more in-depth, generalist type of training for local government officials and private-sector community leaders, particularly in the more populated centers of the state. These (leadership training, senior executive seminars, and public policy meetings) need to be imaginative, meaningful, and to the extent possible, directly applicable to problems and issues of individual communities served.

10. That educational institutions plan and carry out a coordinated program of in-service managerial and supervisory training with a sequence of course offerings. That this program be primarily for middle managers and first-line supervisory personnel in city and county governments.

11. That attention be given to the apparent shortage of instructors for education and training programs for local government personnel. That to deal with this situation:

a. Retraining should be provided for regular teachers who are called upon to teach specialized courses for public personnel.

b. Persons who are not regular teachers, but who have specialized knowledge and abilities, should be recruited and trained for teaching.

c. Tailor-made course materials should be prepared for these teachers, where necessary, by persons acquainted with teaching methods and local government.

d. New teaching devices and techniques should be used to make best use of teaching resources.

12. That if in-service training for local governments is provided on a much larger, coordinated scale, the various resources for financing these programs be re-examined to see whether they are adequate and that consideration be given to an over-all system that will spread the costs equitably over local government as a whole. Such a system would encourage program continuity and wider participation in the training.

13. In summary, that the following activities should be the primary roles of the various groups concerned with in-service training for local government in Iowa.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (CITIES AND COUNTIES)

...Give continuing attention to what their training needs are.

...Provide incentives and rewards for training.

...Provide orientation for new employees on an individual and group basis.

...Develop, with high schools and area community colleges, work-study arrangements and other special in-service programs of study.

...Support existing job skills training opportunities and cooperate with each other to encourage additional job skills programs where needed.

. . . Provide feedback to training agencies so that programs can be evaluated and adjusted to meet needs.

. . . Provide internship programs, in larger governmental units.

ASSOCIATIONS OF LOCAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

. . . Continue to hold conferences and short courses to upgrade functional skills and knowledge and to provide a forum for exchange of ideas and discussion of issues and problems of particular interest to the individual association.

. . . Make known to educational institutions the training needs of their members which they cannot fulfill as an association. Then help promote such programs when they are offered.

. . . Provide the basic orientation training for newly elected or new appointive officials, calling upon educational institutions for assistance in planning and staffing these sessions.

. . . Cooperate with higher educational institutions to provide technical advice and assistance, particularly for the smaller units of government.

. . . Encourage training as part of their association policy.

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

. . . Develop a program to assist local units of government in strengthening their personnel programs, particularly relating to career development and in-service training.

. . . Provide high-level conferences relating to public policy issues.

. . . Develop means to provide effective leadership training for local government top echelon officials and community leaders. This might be a campus-to-city program, for example.

. . . Provide senior executive seminars (administrative generalist training) for top administrators in local government.

. . . Provide field extension services, technical advice and assistance as well as training, to the smaller units of government in cooperation with associations of local officials and employees.

. . . Provide a coordinated program of management and supervisory training on a continuing basis.

. . . Develop teaching materials where needed.

. . . Provide teacher training where needed.

. . . Increase correspondence courses applicable to local government personnel, for credit or noncredit.

. . . Undertake research to assist in evaluation of in-service training programs.

. . . Provide staff where requested for the clearinghouse and the in-service training committee suggested above.

AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

. . . Consider with local officials the possibilities of one- or two-year curricula for pre-service training for local government employment. The training could be for administrative generalists, for technicians to aid in such professional fields as planning and engineering, and for functional specialists such as persons in finance work.

. . . Explore with their local officials possible ways to provide work-study arrangements in local government for persons to attend an area school and work in local government part time simultaneously.

. . . Encourage greater attendance of local governmental officials and employees in existing liberal arts and vocational-technical courses they offer.

. . . Work with local governmental units collectively in the area to develop job skills training programs.

. . . Participate in the continuing program of management and supervisory training.

HIGH SCHOOLS

. . . Cooperate with local governments to provide high school completion opportunities for city and county employees who want them.

. . . Encourage greater attendance of local governmental officials and employees in adult education classes.

. . . Explore with their local officials possible ways to provide work-study arrangements in local government such as are now available in business for high school students.

PART II. THE ROLE OF TITLE I IN PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR IOWA COMMUNITIES

THE CHALLENGES

". . . Most of these enormous developments (scientific, biological, and economic advances) have been stimulated by abundant federal support. There has yet been no such massive push for research and education focused on our social problems and specifically on the number one problem of all, the problem of the cities. If the universities are to provide leadership in our society, how can they be made to contribute more significantly to its major problem?" -- Frederick C. Mosher, Professor, The University of California, Berkeley ("The Universities and the Problem of the Cities," Public Administration Review, November, 1967, p. 326)

"In personal terms, the types and rates of change in contemporary society are leading to accelerating rates of human wreckage--in terms of delinquency, crime, mental illness, and suicide."

"In physical terms, look at urban blight, rural depopulation, traffic congestion, slaughter on the highways."

"In social terms, look at the plight of the poorer third of our fellow citizens--socially isolated, culturally deprived, increasingly underemployed, mostly hopeless--a society of degradation inside an affluent society." -- D. Mack Easton, Dean, Extension Division, University of Colorado ("The Situation Around Title I, Higher Education Act," Speech at National University Extension Association meeting, April, 1967)

"For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems . . . by enabling the Commissioner [of Education] to make grants under this title to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities . . ."

". . . the term, 'community service program' means an educational program, activity or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, . . ." -- Sections 101 and 102, Higher Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-329)

". . . there is a danger of Title I funds being drained away on relatively routine projects at the expense of the broader training. This broader training is essential to cope with the increasingly complex social problems faced by every level of government and usually by a 'mix' of various levels and adjoining geographical jurisdictions . . ."

". . . The participant mix, in such cases, would be leaders and decision-makers and influencers from both the public and private sectors of the community. The common exposure to the community problem involved and the interchange of views regarding it, if well carried out by the educational institution and cooperating groups responsible for the program, could make the public and private groups more fully aware of the myriad problems and issues encompassed, could achieve better mutual understanding of each other's views and problems, and could make a genuine contribution to the solution of the community problem under consideration. . . ."

"It is in this way that Title I may be unique (from other federally assisted programs), and that its in-service training activities may be of unusual value." -- Leo Kramer, Inc.

(In-service Training of State and Local Officials and Employees,
Leo Kramer, Inc., October, 1967, pp. 43 and 47)

"The central problem is to find ways in which our great institutions of higher learning can more directly serve the communities and local governments without sacrificing their academic integrity and intellectual freedom . . ."

"We want to bring the standards of excellence which we prize in our universities to bear upon the practical problems of local communities . . . to get at the citizens at the grass roots level, most of whom have never seen the inside of a university classroom." -- Governor Harold Hughes, Speech to the First Iowa Community Services Conference, January 26, 1967

"Title I was not conceived to serve the undergraduate population or to solve institutional problems. Underlying both these problems is a reluctance on the part of higher education to get involved in the community. I think we all understand some of the sources of this reluctance, and we are not surprised that it creates barriers to effective community service." -- Paul Delker, Director, Community Services and Continuing Education Program, U.S. Office of Education

("Community Service and Continuing Education Programs Under
Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965," Speech at the National
University Extension Association meeting, April, 1967)

"Why is Title I potentially a failure? Because the universities aren't ready for it. . ."

"The universities were not ready for Title I because most of them had no knowledge of how to work with a community as a client--particularly an urban community--and because they were not prepared for a comprehensive, systematic approach to community problems."

". . . I think it is fair to say that an overwhelming majority (of Title I projects nation-wide)--almost all--seem to be discrete, isolated, attacks on a single phase of a complex problem."

"This was to be expected. It was the only way to get started fast, considering the way the law was written. But if this pattern becomes precedent, the program may well be doomed."

"If my state is reasonably typical, we need someone to lead us from project-oriented thinking to problem-oriented thinking, from the approach by discipline or profession to the comprehensive approach." -- D. Mack Easton, in the same speech noted above.

THE BACKGROUND

As was emphasized in Part I of this report,[7] in-service education can be a major factor in achieving excellence in local public service.

Governmental and social problems are national, but the action is in local communities; the performance there affects all of us quite directly. -- Performance depends on people: their abilities, their attitudes, their motivations, and their knowledge on the levels of governmental legislation and operation and of private community leadership. -- Continuing education, informal and formal, can be an important factor affecting the performance of people. Higher educational institutions should provide educational programs aimed at helping to solve these problems.

So goes the theory, and it has much validity.

The Advent of Title I

In 1965, Congress provided a program to help bring the resources of colleges and universities to bear on community problems on a state-by-state basis. This is known as Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It provides federal matching money to colleges and universities for community service programs to assist in the solution of community problems. This money is administered under a state plan developed in each state and may be used for educational and research programs.

Title I is but one of a number of federal programs whose purposes are to encourage and support in-service education relating to community needs. But it is unusual in several respects: (1) its emphasis upon the use of higher education programs to assist in the solution of community problems, (2) its flexibility, permitting each state to define its community problems and to determine how it wants to use its higher education resources to work toward solutions, and (3) its broadness, permitting programs for the private sector as well as public.

---

7. See pages one and two of Part I, which is entitled "In-service Training for Local Government Officials and Employees in Iowa."

Title I Plan in Iowa

The program in Iowa is administered under the general guidance of the State Extension Council of the State Board of Regents with the Dean of the Division of Extension and University Services of The University of Iowa designated as Administrator for the program, which is known as the Iowa Community Services Program. There is also a seventeen-member State Advisory Council for the program.

The Iowa plan for Title I has been, from its beginning, purposefully general anf flexible. Under it, colleges and universities may submit proposals for funding which deal with six general areas of community problems: Government and Community Affairs; Community Health Services; Community Education Services; Community Economic Development Services; Community Social Services; and Community Cultural and Recreational Services. The plan includes a set of criteria under which projects for the annual plan are requested and approved or rejected. In practice, projects which are action-oriented training or education programs have received high preference.

Purpose of This Part of the Report

Four years of programs have been approved, and many have been completed; so it may be time to make a general evaluation of progress and problems as the program operates in Iowa. More particularly, Title I officials have requested that a survey be made of the over-all in-service training needs of local governments and communities to provide information to help determine what the role of Title I might properly be in helping to meet the needs under the Government and Community Affairs section of the state plan.

Therefore, the discussion in this section of the report is aimed primarily at that particular part of the plan; but it touches on all parts of the plan, for the other categories are in a sense subcategories of this broad-titled one.

This portion of the report pinpoints progress made and problem areas; it raises questions about the true purposes of Title I and how to achieve these purposes; and it poses policy questions for the administrators of the program, the State Advisory Council, higher education officials, and community officials and leaders. Lastly, it offers suggestions for possible emphasis under Title I, particularly for in-service education programs for local government officials.

This section, like the first part of this report, attempts to summarize a wide variety of facts, views, and opinions, rather than to reflect the judgments of one person or agency. The sources used in Part I were used for this report and two were added: the Title I plans of ten states and a report entitled

In-Service Training of State and Local Officials and Employees.[8] That report is an evaluation of nation-wide Title I training programs which relate to the subject of its title, and it is recommended as an excellent source for considering the role of Title I.

Review of Training Needs in Iowa

A number of apparent in-service training gaps which pointed to certain additional training needs for local government officials and employees were discussed in Part I. These needs are repeated here in brief to provide background for consideration of how the Title I program might be used to deal with these gaps.

1. More substantive orientation sessions for newly elected county and city officials and for citizens who are appointed to the various boards and commissions.
2. More job skills training for certain jobs.
3. Greatly expanded programs of supervisory and management training.
4. A senior executive type program for top echelon administrative officials.
5. More mid-career training opportunities.
6. More public policy and leadership training, involving the private as well as public sector.
7. Programs to assist local government officials in their public relations training and public information programs, leading to better public understanding and appreciation of local government services.
8. Programs to teach persons in supervisory capacities how to train their personnel.
9. Increased use of work-study arrangements.
10. Formal training for members of boards and commissions.
11. More formal training for county personnel.

---

[8] *In-Service Training of State and Local Officials and Employees*, Leo Kramer, Inc., October, 1967. The report was prepared for the U.S. Office of Education.

12. Increased training in personnel administration, particularly in the area of labor relations.

13. Increased technical and advisory assistance and extension training programs for part-time officials and department heads, particularly in small communities.

THE PROGRAMS

Projects Authorized under the State Plan

As noted above, the state plan in Iowa gives priority to programs (projects) in six broad areas of community problems. The plan permits a wide variety of activities within each category, as is illustrated by the following quotes regarding the first two categories:

"Within each of the areas a number of aspects of each problem have been identified as examples. The program areas are:

1. Government and Community Affairs. Credit or noncredit courses, in-service training programs, conferences, institutes, and workshops designed to improve the skills, knowledge, understanding, and competence of local government officials and employees such as city managers, mayors, police officers, firemen, planning and zoning officials, urban renewal officials, housing and building code inspectors, water and sewer plant operators, parks and recreation personnel, and others.

2. Community Health Services. Consultation and conferences with local health personnel and other community leadership in attempts to work out coordinated programs to deal with such community health problems as water and air pollution, alcoholism, immunization programs, communicable disease control, sanitation and environmental health; post graduate training programs and conferences with such health personnel as doctors, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, hospital administrators, and others to improve and update their skills in dealing with community health problems; training of teachers of licensed practical nurses; assistance in prevention and treatment work in mental health; training programs for public health nurses and others to prepare them to deal more effectively with the problems of the aged and persons in low-income circumstances."

Accomplishments

Anyone reviewing the Title I projects in Iowa would be impressed by the number and variety of programs. Including the projects which have been approved for the 1968-69 fiscal year, 129 have been or will be carried out over a four-year authorization period.

Actually there have been about 100 different programs, for twenty have been renewed at least once. Therefore, despite the fact that Congressional appropriations are on a year-to-year basis and accordingly no grant is made by Title I officials in Iowa for more than one year, some continuity of programming has been achieved by renewing programs.

Title I has permitted experimentation, both in types of projects and methods of carrying out the educational programs. It undoubtedly has stimulated many projects which would not have been attempted if federal grants had not been available, and under it some projects have been undertaken which suggest new approaches for dealing with community problems or are of likely long-range impact.

Title I has served as an incentive for persons in higher education to be more in touch with community problems. Likewise community officials and leaders undoubtedly have become more aware of the resources of colleges and universities that are available to their communities. In other words, it has served as a catalyst for bringing persons from the two groups together.

Also, Title I has strengthened the community service programs of the universities and colleges.

Analysis of Projects

The 129 individual projects were analyzed to provide a general picture of the kinds of projects which have been funded for the four-year authorization period (1965-66 fiscal year through the 1968-69 fiscal year).

Kinds. Most of the programs are conferences, workshops, and short courses. In the tabulation which follows, conferences are distinguished from workshops by the format and content of the program and the degree of participant involvement. Short courses are considered to be courses where a class met for a set period of time each week for a number of successive weeks, or in a few cases, they are courses where a class met every day for a week or more. Conferences and workshops are further divided into two groups: those held in a single location and those held at several locations (regional meetings). The miscellaneous category mainly includes program development and problem identification projects, plus fine arts presentations (music, drama, and art) to communities throughout the state. (See chart on following page.)

Continuing Programs. As noted above, twenty of the projects have been renewed. Seven have been renewed twice, and thirteen once.

Topics. If the reader could examine the applications for each project, he undoubtedly would be amazed at the project differences: the variety of topics, length of programs, variations in levels of funding, etc. The

	Number of Projects
Conferences (single location)	23
Workshops (single location)	21
Conferences and workshops, held regionally	19
Short courses	24
Correspondence courses	6
Consulting or other extension type activity	10
Miscellaneous	26
	129

following categorization of projects gives some indication of the wide variety of projects.

	Number of Projects
Community education training and service	17
Local government management and supervision	15
Urban planning, community renewal, housing and codes	11
Law enforcement and fire protection	5
Intergovernmental relations	4
Recreation and parks	3
Social welfare	5
Other local government projects	25
Community improvement and development	4
Health management and supervisory training	5
Water pollution control and sanitation	3
Pharmacy	3
Other health projects	7
Management and leadership training (nongovernment)	9
Fine arts	7
Miscellaneous	6
	129

Audiences. The impression may be that Title I projects are almost exclusively for public officials. This is not the case in Iowa. Although th audiences for the projects more often than not are public officials, more than one-half of the projects involve audiences which are completely or partly from the private sector.

Program Development. In at least seven instances, funds have been made available for program development projects. In a sense, of course, all of the projects necessitate program development activities, but the seven listed below have their major, or exclusive, emphasis on program development.

1. Development of an Integrated Series of Police Short Courses.
2. School Building Planning Information Dissemination.
3. Identification and Articulation by Local Officials of Their Problems and Needs.
4. Development of the Iowa Plan for In-service Education in Local Government Management.
5. Development and Implementation of Health Education Curricula and Teaching Materials for Use in the Elementary and Junior High Schools.
6. Instruction of Public School Teachers to Teach Teachers' Aides.
7. School-Agency Cooperation (a pilot program).

THE PROBLEMS

With any new program such as Title I, problems are to be expected. Some of the problems discussed below are inherent in the law or relate to clarification of the philosophy and purposes of the law; others relate to the policies and procedures in Iowa.

This report is not intended to be an exhaustive analysis of every problem or question that might be raised under the Title I program. Rather it is an attempt to focus rather briefly on some major considerations with the hope that it will stimulate discussion about existing programs and will aid in determining future policy.

What is the Real Intent of Title I?

It is hard to say for sure. The wording of the law, though quite broad, is rather clear; the intent is (1) "to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities" and (2) to assist in the solution of community problems through community service programs.

But how?

The federal act leaves this decision to each state, within broad limits. Such flexibility has merit, for community problems vary considerably from state to state, both in kind and degree, and each state should be permitted to use its resources in dealing with those community problems it deems to be most important and urgent.

So it should not be difficult for any state to satisfy the general intent of the Title I Act. But it would seem that the over-riding emphasis of the law is the solution of community problems. Does this implied directive point up the need for carefully identifying problems and then giving priority to projects which deal with the most important problems to which college and university resources can be applied effectively? Does this interpretation represent the real intent of the law?

Perhaps the real intent is something else. It may be a mechanism to call attention to the need for community change; its main thrust, then, might be for education programs to enable persons locally to better understand and cope with complex problems, largely social ones. Or it may be that the real intent is simply to stimulate increased participation of higher education institutions in the process of community problem solving by providing a means for increased rapport and better understanding between college and university people and community leaders.

Community Problems

What are the major community problems in Iowa? How are these being identified? Which ones are most important? To which ones can college and university resources and capabilities be applied most effectively?

These would appear to be the big questions. Answers to them can pinpoint which community problems might best be attacked by Title I projects in Iowa. There has been some attempt to get answers to these questions, but relatively little emphasis has been given to finding the answers under the Title I program itself. Apparently there has been an urgency to get projects started which are action-oriented (mostly education and training) and which involve a wide variety of problems and academic disciplines. This emphasis has not permitted much time or money for substantial program planning, including research which might be involved in such planning.

Several state-wide meetings have been held by Title I authorities to receive ideas from local government officials and other community leaders as to the problems of their communities. In the government area, the major problem areas according to the local officials seem to be:

1. Poor citizen understanding and interest in community problems and local government operation and inadequate know-how locally to find ways of informing and involving the public.
2. Need for models to develop intergovernmental agreements.
3. Need for operational handbooks for various local government offices.
4. Lack of resources to encourage organizational experimentation, such as a pilot program to have an engineer or manager for all the communities located in a single county or group of counties.
5. Youth problems.
6. Need for assistance in using consultants.
7. Lack of knowledge about data processing, particularly in smaller governmental units.
8. Need for additional in-service training.

These may be the major problem areas of local government in Iowa, for

ⓐ

they do reflect the views of leaders in local government. Omitted from this list, however, are problems which have received considerable attention in the press or which have been recognized as almost traditional to local government. Perhaps these were not mentioned at the Title I meetings because they seemed so obvious, or seemed so hopeless, or seemed to be problems which higher education would not want to become involved with. They are:

1. Inadequate financial resources for city governments.
2. Run-down neighborhoods and declining central business districts.
3. Congestion, particularly traffic and parking problems.
4. Inadequate over-all coordination of local agencies, public and private, in handling community problems.
5. Areas of the state (counties, cities, and towns) that are losing population.
6. Difficulties of adapting local governments to rapid social changes and problems.
7. Loss of capable persons in key positions who are being attracted away from local government at a time when a larger number of capable persons is needed.

These problems overlap. As someone has said, they are a part of the "organized complexity" of today's society, and perhaps more emphasis should be given to treating these problems as they are interrelated, rather than treating them singly.

Other Types of Problems under Title I

The problems listed below are based primarily on observations of the operation of the Title I program in Iowa, but many are probably not unique to Iowa, because they are caused in part by the very nature of the Title I law and federal policies. Solutions to these problems are not easy. They are not outlined here, however, as insurmountable obstacles, but rather as matters to consider seriously if the Title I state plan and policies are revised.

Project Orientation versus Problem Orientation. For a number of reasons (the urgency of getting projects started and showing immediate results, the general nature of the problem areas identified under the state plan, the policy to encourage innovation, etc.) grants have been made for more than thirty projects each year, on the average, dealing with a wide variety of community problems.

The federal grant to Iowa currently is $167,000 per year, including the cost of administering the program. This means that the funding level for individual projects is relatively low: less than $10,000 for a large majority of the projects. Furthermore, most of the programs are one-shot affairs, funded for one year only, although twenty programs have been repeated for at least two years. This pattern indicates that the approach to Title I in Iowa has been largely project-oriented rather than problem-oriented. Also, it raises the question of whether programs with limited funding and lasting only one year are dealing effectively with significant community problems.

Two other matters relate to this problem. Under current policies, it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify a major significant community problem, do the necessary program planning, carry out the projects, and appraise the success of the projects in the time allotted. This process takes time; for many projects it would require a span of years, not the one year allotted for programs now.

Many of the projects are one-time conferences, workshops, short courses, or seminars. They are designed to deal indirectly, and sometimes directly, with community problems. It is difficult, though, to evaluate the effectiveness of these education or training projects as community problem-solving devices. In fact, this difficulty raises the significant question of whether education programs in the traditional sense, even those that are extension or adult education type, can aid directly in community problem solving, and if the answer is "yes," how can it be done?

The State-wide Approach. Colleges and universities face a dilemma in developing programs to help solve community problems on a state-wide basis.

Some Title I projects in Iowa have been aimed at individual communities; they are attempts to deal with problems as they exist in that particular community. But the vast majority of projects seem to deal with community problems through a general, abstract approach. Under this approach, the project is carried on in isolation from the immediate concerns of individual communities. The community is at position "A." The project advocates position "C," many times in the abstract, but the project does not tell participants how to get from "A" to "C." The apparent hope is that the participant will take what he learns back to his community and apply it. Does this happen? Who knows?

The raising of these questions does not mean that certain problems are not common to many communities; nor does it mean that the general, abstract approach does not have merit. But, if the basic purpose of Title I is to aid in the solving of community problems, greater recognition perhaps should be given to the fact that problems are localized and therefore the solutions might be sought through projects that are localized and personalized. In a sense, there is a paradox: community problems are localized, yet Title I programs under current policies (federal and state) must appear to serve the state generally.

The Role of Higher Education. Colleges and universities historically have been detached from community. Title I seemingly calls upon them to play a different role: somehow to get involved in the solution of community problems and, perhaps, to be interveners in community affairs.

The challenge to the colleges and universities is the decision as to whether they want to become involved, and if so, to what extent and how. They must analyze what their current capabilities and resources are, what they can muster additionally, and what the pros and cons are in getting involved with community affairs, in terms of maintaining their traditional education programs and in terms of their image of objectivity and detachment.

Related to this decision is the crucial question as to whether colleges and universities are equipped to deal with community problems. From a community problem identification standpoint, they are quite well equipped, but this type of service involves research more than education programs. From a community problem solving standpoint, however, there is considerable question as to what they can do. Here's a major reason why. Higher education institutions have long been accepted as having a key role in the solving of problems in the scientific and technical fields, but this acceptance has not been achieved in the government and social problem areas. This may be an important reason why most Title I projects are at best indirect approaches to community problem solving and are carried out on a small scale.

One other point. Universities and colleges are not interdisciplinary; academic departments have functioned largely independently of each other. Yet the solving of community problems may call for a coordinated, interdisciplinary approach. As a practical matter, therefore, colleges and universities which are interested in designing significant, comprehensive Title I programs of this type are confronted with the problem of how to do it within the existing system. They are confronted with finding ways to muster persons in various disciplines who are interested in working together in dealing with community problems. Furthermore, they must find ways to bring these resources to a practical setting and problem.

Summary

Briefly, the major policy related problems apparently are:

1. Question as to the real intent of the law.

2. Question as to the adequacy of program planning.

3. The difficulties involved in identifying truly significant community problems which colleges and universities can help solve.

4. "Project-itus"--too many programs with limited value.

5. The short-term nature of programs, due to one-year funding by Congress.

6. The difficulty of designing state-wide projects which are applicable to particular needs and problems of individual communities.

7. The question of the extent to which colleges and universities can, and want to, get involved in community problem solving.

8. The problem of coordinating higher education resources and manpower, both within and between institutions, for projects which will have major impacts on community problems.

POLICY QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The preceding discussions of programs and problems point to a number of policy questions for Title I officials in Iowa. If they plan to revise the state plan generally, or the portion relating to the government and community affairs section of it particularly, the following questions concerning policies should be given attention.

Policies

--Who should be the audience for Title I programs? Currently the projects seem to be trying to serve everyone. At the local government level, for example, should projects be aimed at top echelon officials, or at any and all levels? Should the projects emphasize interaction between private groups and government? Can Title I serve the problems and needs of small communities? Should projects be aimed primarily at large cities? Or should they be for all local governmental units, regardless of size?

--What kinds of community problems can most effectively be dealt with through the resources of colleges and universities? The answers to this question are unclear at present. What can be done to get the answers? What can be done to get agreement among community officials and academicians on what these community problems are? Should more program planning be funded? Should community problems be pinpointed for individual communities, and projects be encouraged under the state plan which will deal with these localized problems? Or is it better to continue projects which deal with community problems on a general or state-wide basis?

--What can be done to encourage project applications with more substance and long-range impact? Should there be fewer projects, which would mean larger grants, or is it better to spread the money among as many projects and institutions as possible? Put another way, should innovation and experimentation be encouraged on a narrow or broad scale? Or can both types be financed simultaneously?

--Should the state plan have fewer areas for which project proposals can be submitted? When project proposals are requested each year, should the state plan contain a statement of particular community problems for which proposals for projects will receive highest priority?

--Can long-term projects (for more than one year) be encouraged? Can ways be found to provide continuity for projects which obviously would take more than one year to plan, staff, and complete? This, of course, would involve negotiation with federal officials because of the uncertainty of federal appropriations from one year to the next.

--Are we achieving over-all coordination of Title I projects? This is an important question in two respects: (1) to avoid duplication of existing programs and (2) to get cooperation within institutions and among them, particularly on major projects.

Suggestions

1. That Title I officials review the state plan and the policies related to the plan.
    a. That ways be found to identify community problems in more depth. Wisconsin grants Title I money for this purpose.
    b. That higher educational resources and faculty which can be brought to bear on community problems be identified and catalogued. Oklahoma has done this.
    c. That ways be found to encourage increased rapport on a problem identification and problem-solving level between community leaders and academic personnel. It may be that colleges and universities do not have the answers to community problems, but that they have the resources (time and talent) to help local leaders pinpoint problems and find answers.
    d. That the state plan each year identify one, two, or three major problems for which high priority would be given when grant applications are made. All institutions should be given adequate advance notice of what these problems are to encourage program planning and cooperative projects. Apparently a number of states do this, including Ohio, Michigan, Georgia, and California.
    e. That each college and university be encouraged to limit its efforts on Title I programs to those areas it is best qualified to handle.
    f. That ways be found to provide long-term, substantial projects with adequate funding so that the institutions involved can have this assurance in their staffing and planning and so that projects will have greater impact.
2. That in the area of government and community affairs projects, if

this separate area is continued in the state plan, priority be given to the following types of programs, but not necessarily in this sequence:

a. Programs to help local leaders find ways to achieve better public understanding of and appreciation for local government services and problems.

b. Programs to take leadership training into communities.

c. Programs to provide managerial and supervisory training for local government officials and employees on a continuing basis. This should involve as many educational institutions as possible.

d. Programs to take the campus to the city, in the sense that teams of academic personnel would meet with community leaders of individual communities to exchange views and to work together in identifying and finding solutions to community problems.

e. Programs to deal significantly with the government problems of the small community, characterized by the lack of trained officials and employees, most of whom are part time.

PART III. PROGRESS REPORT: DEVELOPMENT OF IOWA PLAN FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1967, the Institute of Public Affairs of The University of Iowa submitted a proposal to Title I officials for a substantial grant to finance the development of an in-service education program in local government management for city and county personnel in Iowa.

In its application, the Institute expressed the view that Iowa local governments, as is true nation-wide, need more knowledgeable and resourceful persons in key positions in local government and that one significant way to deal with this problem would be to provide college level in-service training opportunities on a continuing basis for persons who are or will be in positions of managerial responsibility. The Institute also expressed the view that considerable planning should precede the inauguration of the program and that this planning should have three phases:

Phase 1. An assessment of the educational and experience levels of managerial and supervisory employees in local government and an inventory of relevant training programs now available to these persons.

Phase 2. Formulation of a curriculum and a plan of action for offering and teaching the courses under the program. This would involve such matters as choosing the courses and the methods of offering them, developing materials, recruiting instructors, and determining administrative and financial policies.

Phase 3. Spurring interest and support for the program among local government officials and personnel, educators, and professional groups.

Instead of funding this project in its entirety, Title I officials made a grant to the Institute: (a) to begin the Local Government Management Training project, primarily for Phase 1, and (b) to survey training needs and resources for all local government personnel in Iowa and to make suggestions regarding meeting these needs, particularly regarding the coordination of programs and the use of Title I money for local government training.

The first two parts of this report were written as a result of the latter survey requested by Title I officials.[9] The information which follows is a progress report on the surveys and field work done to begin the development of the Local Government Management Training program. It includes the following types of information:

1. Data on the personal and educational backgrounds of persons in managerial and supervisory positions in local government in Iowa.

2. Data on the views of these persons regarding the need for in-service training for themselves and persons in their kinds of positions in local government.

3. An outline of how the Institute intends to proceed during the coming year in the development of the Iowa Plan for In-Service Education in Local Government Management. This planning will be financed in part by a significant grant from the federal government under Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964.

The data for items "1" and "2" above were gathered largely from a questionnaire administered by the Institute to about 1,600 city and county officials and employees, most of whom hold managerial or supervisory positions.

NEED FOR MANAGEMENT TRAINING

Before discussing the results of the questionnaire, it might be well to deal with the question of whether in-service training is really needed in Iowa for persons in these local government positions. This point was touched upon in the two previous reports of the Institute, but the need for this particular type of training is re-emphasized here because of its high importance in the over-all training picture.

In its application for the Title I grant, the Institute stressed that persons in middle management and first-level supervisory positions often find their skill level lowered, their perspective limited, and their opportunities for advancement stifled because of the lack of adequate training in public management. Similarly, persons in local government who have specialized academic training and professional experience find the transition from specialist to administrator hard to make because they lack training in the governmental process generally and in public management specifically.

---

9. See Part I entitled, "In-Service Training for Local Government Officials and Employees in Iowa," and Part II entitled, "The Role of Title I in Providing Educational Programs for Iowa Communities."

But the need for training is acknowledged by others: nation-wide authorities, academicians, and Iowa local government officials themselves.

The International City Managers' Association, in the report it made following a survey of municipal training needs in the United States, said:

> Management is a profession by itself and should have its own set of criteria for education and training. For too many years both industry and government glorified the knowledgeable specialist who managed by the seat of his pants . . . The tremendous changes that have taken place during the past sixteen years have amply demonstrated that administrators cannot be haphazardly developed. Because a man is a good engineer or accountant does not mean he is a good manager. He needs special pre-entry and post-entry training to equip him for the rigorous demands of management.[12]

In its report on the governmental manpower situation, the Nation Manpower Council stated that governments are significant consumers of manpower and therefore have the responsibility for utilizing their manpower to the best of their abilities, and the manpower shortage in administrative positions in government was emphasized particularly. The report questioned whether government can afford to have persons who are underemployed and underskilled or who are using inefficient methods, and it suggested that:

> Governmental agencies and departments can try to meet their requirements for administrators in three ways: by retaining competent individuals as long as possible . . . , by developing executive and managerial skills and capacities in employees through programs of training and promotion; and by recruiting experienced personnel from private and other government employers.[13]

In a recent issue of the Public Administration Review, a number of prominent educators commented on the need for improved education (pre-entry and post-entry) for the public service.[14] One said: "Surely the most

---

10. A Report on the In-Service Training Programs for Key Personnel, (Washington, D.C.: International City Managers' Association, 1961), p. 20.

11. Government and Manpower, (New York, National Manpower Council: Columbia University Press, 1964), pp. 4, 5, and 28.

12. "Higher Education for Public Service," Public Administration Review, (November, 1967), pp. 301, 321, and 326. Comments were made by James M. Banovetz (Loyola University), John C. Honey (Syracuse University), and Frederick C. Moser (University of California), respectively.

intriguing aspect of higher education for the public service is that there is so little of it." Another emphasized this point by observing that, ". . . the percentage of persons in the public service at responsible levels who are primarily trained in public administration is probably not more than 3 or 4 per cent."

Another pointed out the need for training administrative generalists: "Very probably, as there is deepening of specialization in government and in professional education, there is logarithmic growth in the need of people who are capable of seeing the longer and broader goals and of coordinating and integrating specialized activities toward those goals."

Admittedly, these comments are about government nation-wide and not local government in Iowa, but surely they have applicability to Iowa local government and serve to emphasize the need for post-entry training of persons already in administrative positions in local government.

As will be shown in more detail in the next few pages, Iowa city and county government personnel in managerial and supervisory positions believe that they can benefit from additional training. In addition, discussions with key persons in local government associations revealed the need for considerably more training of this type, particularly for: (1) middle managers, (2) first-line supervisors, and (3) personnel who could be promoted to supervisory responsibilities if their capabilities for supervising could be upgraded through training.

Is in-service training the answer to the problem of getting adequate, well-qualified administrative manpower needed to provide the increasingly higher quality of local government services expected today in Iowa? Not solely. However, it is believed that a formalized education program for managerial and supervisory personnel, combined with informal on-the-job learning experiences, can accomplish the following major objectives:

1. Upgrade the level of administrative expertise in local government in Iowa and establish a higher plane of professional expectations among local government employees.

2. Provide an entree into the administrative and managerial levels for the underemployed and the relatively new local government employees.

3. Establish a corps of subprofessional managers and administrators who would form a reservoir of trained, competent talent for local governments.

4. Raise the image of public service at the local level which, among other benefits, should help attract desirable candidates to local government service.

SURVEY OF MANAGERIAL AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

For background information to use in making decisions about the development of the in-service training program in government management, a survey was made of city and county personnel, most of whom are in managerial and supervisory positions. The survey was conducted to obtain three types of information:

1. Their educational and experience levels.
2. Their views concerning training they need.
3. Types of managerial and supervisory training now available to them.

Survey Method

A questionnaire was prepared to obtain twenty-five kinds of information. Because it is believed that the majority of persons who would take advantage of this training work for the larger city and county governments and because an estimated one-half of local government managerial and supervisory personnel are in these larger units, most of the information was collected from them. The larger units, for purposes of this survey, were considered to be the twenty-seven cities of more than 10,000 population and the twenty-one county governments in which those cities are located.

Institute staff members went to these counties and cities to explain the purposes of the survey and, while there, administered the questionnaire to groups of managerial and supervisory personnel. In a number of places where meetings could not be arranged, particularly in county governments, the questionnaires were given to a key official who asked the proper persons to fill them in and return them to the Institute. In addition, because of the importance of the county road departments in every county regardless of size, questionnaires were mailed to the county engineer's office in each county of the state that had not been previously contacted requesting that the engineer have his supervisory personnel fill it in.

Responses to the Questionnaire

On the whole, the response to the questionnaire was good; 1,594 questionnaires were filled in, 1,151 from cities and 443 from counties. Practically every one of the large cities responded, and questionnaires were filled in by some personnel in two-thirds of the twenty-one large counties.

Although not all managerial and supervisory personnel in these larger units answered the questionnaire, the number who did is equivalent, it is estimated, to nearly one-half of the persons in these kinds of positions in all municipal and county governments in the state. There are an estimated 3,500 to 3, 900 persons in these positions counting members of county boards of supervisors and police and fire department command officers beneath the rank of captain (that is lieutenants and sergeants). Without these two classes of positions, there are an estimated 2, 900 to 3, 300 in managerial and supervisory positions.

Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix B to this report show the number of persons who responded to the questionnaire, by the department in which they work and by the level of their positions. Close to 900 of the 1, 600 returns were from department heads and assistant department heads.

Although the returns provide a good cross section of city departments, the fire, police, public works, and utility personnel comprise more than one-half of the responses. This is to be expected, for these are the larger departments in city government in terms of numbers of personnel. Also, some of the police and fire personnel and a few others from other departments who do not hold supervisory positions filled in the questionnaire, and their replies were included in the survey results.

At the county level, more than one-third of the responses were from county road department managerial and supervisory personnel. This high percentage was due to the fact that all ninety-nine county road departments were contacted whereas other county officials were contacted in only twenty-one counties.

From what has been pointed out, it is clear that a scientific sampling method was not used for this survey. This was not the intention. Rather, the technique used was designed to get a fairly large cross section of county and city officials in responsible positions to participate in the survey. That goal was accomplished. The survey, therefore, provides information about the backgrounds and views of these persons, which it is believed presents a fairly representative picture of persons in these capacities in local government in Iowa.

However, because of the predominance of fire, police, and county road personnel, some of the tables in the appendix show, separately from other officials, the information for policemen and firemen (below the rank of assistant chief) and for county road personnel. For the most part, however, the responses of these persons were very similar to other officials in managerial and supervisory capacities.

The discussion which follows presents only highlights of the information obtained from the questionnaire. As noted above, twenty-five kinds of data were obtained, which provide a comprehensive profile of this level of public employment in Iowa that can be used for additional purposes such as for manpower surveys.

Personal Backgrounds and Experience

Questions were asked to obtain the age, education, and work experience of the persons who responded. The information collected provides information that heretofore has not been available and therefore will be useful in developing the in-service training program.

Age. City and county officials who responded to the questionnaire appear to be relatively young, considering the responsible positions they hold. Here is the general picture; the details may be found in Table 3 of Appendix B.

	City		County	Total
40 or younger	354	(187)	108	462
41-50 years of age	424	(177)	138	562
51 or older	370	(104)	195	565
No response	3		2	5

The figures in parentheses are for policemen and firemen below the rank of assistant chief. Policemen and firemen have a lower effective retirement age than other local officials, which certainly has a bearing on the "youngness" of city officials on the whole, but even discounting them, one should not conclude that many local government officials are near or past 65. Look at these figures.

	City		County	Total
More than 50 years old	370	(104)	195	565
More than 55	175	(32)	140	315
More than 60	78	(15)	85	163
More than 65	28	(3)	36	64

In city government, only about 15 per cent of the respondents were more than fifty-five years old. The percentage is higher in counties (about one-third of the total), but even here, two-thirds of the respondents are more than ten years away from the normal retirement age of sixty-five.

The relative "youngness" of these officials indicates that a great many, far more than a majority, are still at an age where they would be interested in in-service training.

Education. Table 4 shows the formal schooling of the persons who responded to the survey. (See Appendix B.) It shows that:

--one out of six (279) are college graduates (have four or more years of college)

--another one out of six (258) have some college education

--another one out of six (282) have not completed high school

--the remainder (739) have a high school diploma, but did not attend college.

Not counting policemen and firemen below the rank of assistant chief, one-fourth (168) of the respondents from city governments have a college degree, and thirty-three of them have advanced degrees. Forty per cent of this group have had some college. Of the county officials who responded, more than 20 per cent (97) have a college degree, and 40 per cent of this group have had some college.

The predominant types of undergraduate degrees for both city and county officials are engineering and business. At the graduate level, 14 of the 21 degrees for county officials are in law, but there is no predominant kind for city officials.

Two of every three persons who responded said that they have taken some schooling or training (other than regular college level course work) since high school. Seven hundred and eighty-eight city officials and 255 county officials said this, which indicates that proportionately city officials have had this type of schooling or training more than county officials.

These persons have received this training in a variety of ways, but the most common ways by far are university or professional short courses. To the question asked concerning how recently this training was taken, 166 said that they were enrolled currently, while at the opposite extreme 515 said that their last training was prior to 1965, and about one-half that number said it was before 1955.

From the information concerning education, some conclusions can be drawn related to the development of the in-service local government management program:

1. The formal educational levels of these officials vary a great deal.

2. There is a rather high formal educational level for a significant number of these officials and this formal education seems to be rather specialized.

3. These persons have demonstrated that they will participate in continuing education programs. On the other hand, a sizable portion of them have not been involved in a continuing education program recently.

Work Experience. City and county officials were asked for whom they worked immediately before they came to their present jobs. More than 1,100 of the 1,600 replied that they worked for private business. A relatively smaller portion said that they worked for a government as their immediate previous employment, indicating some but not a great deal of mobility between governments, as shown by the following information:

	Number
To municipal government--	
from another municipal government	65
from the federal government	62
from a state government	26
from a school system	24
from a county government	20
To county government--	
from another county government	56
from a state government	49
from the federal government	23
from a municipal government	16
from a school system	10

As might be expected, those officials in responsible positions have rather long tenure. About 60 per cent of them have worked with their city or county for more than ten years, and the tenure is longer in cities than in counties, as shown in the following totals:

	City		County		Total	
Years of Service	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
At least 10 years	753	65	188	42	941	59
At least 15 years	559	49	138	31	697	44
At least 20 years	337	29	82	19	419	26

In response to the question as to how long they have been in their present position, it is significant that more than one-third of the city officials replied that they have been in their present position for less than three years, while about one-fourth of the county officials said this. On the other hand, two out of five of these city officials have been in their present position from five to fifteen years, and about thee of five of these county officials have been in their present positions that long.

For purposes of the development of the in-service government management training program, the work experience of these persons indicates that:

1. Persons come with business experience into government much more often than with government experience. This raises the question as to what

experience and training they received in business that is applicable to government.

2. Persons in these positions have considerable tenure in their governmental unit, more so in city employment than in county. Most are not novices in the art of government, and they probably have considerable knowledge about the operation of it.

3. They also have quite a bit of experience in the positions they now hold. However, a significant number have been in their current capacity for less than three years, indicating probably a fair degree of upward mobility (promotion) and need for in-service training to handle additional responsibilities.

Willingness for Additional Training

Persons who answered the questionnaire were asked to indicate their willingness to take courses in any or all of three different ways. Their responses are shown in Table 5 of Appendix B. In general, the responses show that:

1. Nearly 70 per cent would be willing to enroll in training or continuing education courses if offered at night at a nearby college or community college.

2. Nearly 60 per cent would be willing to enroll in noncredit courses offered by the state universities.

3. Forty-seven per cent would be willing to take a series of courses, two per year for three years, leading to a certificate (nondegree program) in government management.

4. A larger proportion of city officials than county officials expressed a willingness to participate in such courses.

Additional questions were asked of those who indicated a willingness to enroll in courses.

Of those who said that they would be willing to attend a course at night at a nearby college or area school:

1. 565 said they would attend one night a week, another
   462 said they would attend two nights, and
   75 others said they would attend three nights.

2. 618 would travel up to 15 miles to attend, and another
   342 would drive up to 30 miles, but not much interest was
   shown in traveling more than 30 miles.

3. 274 said they would not be willing to pay any portion of tuition costs;
   486 others said they would pay up to $20;
   224 others said they would pay up to $40; and another
   160 would pay at least $60.

Those who said that they would be willing to enroll in noncredit courses at a state university prefer the following ways of taking the courses.

First Choice	Second Choice	
32%	22%	One day per week for 10-12 weeks
25	29	Three days per week, three times per year
22	23	Two-week short course
17	20	Correspondence study
4	6	Educational TV (guided study with TV in the home)

Of this same group:

226 said that they would not be willing to pay tuition;
408 others said that they would pay up to $20;
198 others said that they would pay up to $40; and another
137 would pay at least $60.

Kinds of Courses Preferred

They were also asked which courses they preferred for persons in their positions. Fourteen choices were provided plus an opportunity to write in any other course. Each respondent was asked to check his five top preferences. The responses are summarized in Tables 6 and 7 of Appendix B. The five courses of most interest were: human relations and psychology, supervisory practices in public management, personnel administration, governmental public relations and communications, and management planning.

Not far behind in preference were three courses: public speaking and writing, general public administration, and public law.

Abilities Required for Position

City officials feel that the abilities or skills most important for their positions are: (1) supervisory skills, and (2) technical skills for work in their department, in that order. County officials who filled in the questionnaire chose the same two, but in reverse order of importance. Both groups agreed that "ability to get along with people" was of third importance, but considerably below the first two abilities. Considered to be of relative unimportance were: general knowledge of the operation of government, general public administration, and office management skills. (See Tables 8 and 9 of Appendix B.)

MANAGERIAL AND SUPERVISORY TRAINING NOW AVAILABLE

Opportunities for local government officials to obtain managerial and supervisory training from Iowa agencies are spotty. Furthermore, although there are some opportunities to receive such training from agencies outside the state, the courses generally are not readily available, must be taken by correspondence, or are designed primarily for the top echelon of officials or for managers for specialized functions such as police or hospital administration. (A listing of these programs is included in Appendix A of this report.)

Within the state, the three state universities and Drake University primarily, plus a few other agencies, have provided a variety of programs for this kind of in-service training, but there is little continuity to the programs and a minimum of coordination among the agencies which offer them. Furthermore, almost without exception, these are one-shot courses in the sense that there is no sequence of courses; rather each course offered stands by itself.

The courses are usually one of three types: (1) short course of two to five consecutive days; (2) short course in which classes are held one day per week for several hours for eight to twelve weeks; (3) correspondence courses. For the most part, the short courses are not held on a regular basis. Exceptions are the courses for police command officers, fire command officers, and nursing supervisors, which are held annually, and for welfare directors and supervisors which are held several times per year. The correspondence courses are offered periodically, some annually and some every few years.

Most of these courses seem to be for city department heads and deal primarily with management techniques, although there are a few courses on human relations, leadership, and communications. In discussions with key persons in city and county government and with officials in state associations, the comment was frequently made that top officials in local government, through conferences and meetings and their previous experience, have ample opportunity to gain a perspective of governmental and management affairs, but middle-managers and first-line supervisors have little or no opportunity for in-service training to learn supervisory and management skills and to gain a broader perspective of the operation of government. The comment was also made that recruitment of existing personnel for supervisory positions would be aided by more in-service educational opportunities that would help equip these persons to assume supervisory responsibilities.

Apparently, in Iowa, there are few senior executive-type courses or seminars available to top local officials: mayors, county supervisors, city managers, and department heads of larger cities and counties. Such training would include sessions in leadership, decision making, and utilization of modern management systems and techniques.

National professional organizations provide managerial and supervisory courses on a nation-wide basis in which Iowa local government officials can enroll. The International City Managers' Association offers fifteen courses which may be taken by correspondence, or a city may group enroll a number of its personnel and have the course taught locally. It has also provided high level managerial training, primarily for city managers.

The Public Personnel Association provides five-week short courses in personnel management in alternate years. The American Hospital Association offers numerous short courses in hospital management and administration. Other organizations which offer one or two management courses are: American Public Works Association, American Public Welfare Association, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment, American Waterworks Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and National Recreation and Park Association.

As noted above, the problem with these courses is that they are not readily available for most local government officials in Iowa.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS FROM SURVEYS

1. Additional in-service training in management and supervision is needed. Existing programs are spotty; they are uncoordinated, single courses for the most part, and often not readily available.

2. This training is needed (a) to upgrade management skills and broaden the understandings of middle management, and (b) to provide supervisory skills and human and public relations training for first-line supervisors and persons likely to be promoted to such positions. Senior executive type management training also apparently is needed, although not on as large a scale.

3. Local government personnel who responded to the questionnaire (about one-half of the more than 3,000 in these positions) indicated considerable interest in additional in-service training for themselves. They prefer courses close to home on a short-term basis, but nearly one-half of them expressed a willingness to take a series of courses over a period of years. A large majority who are interested would pay part of the cost of the course if this were necessary.

4. For many of them, their education and experience levels are fairly high, although there is, of course, a wide variation in education and experience among the surveyed group as a whole. While two-thirds of them have had some type of continuing education, of those who have had training, one-half of them have had no training since 1965 and about one-fourth of them, no training since 1955.

5. Courses related to handling personnel (human relations, personnel administration, and supervisory practices), handling public relations aspects of their jobs (including public speaking and writing), and handling management planning are of most interest to these persons, but there was significant interest shown in eleven of fourteen courses included in the survey.

PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM

As was pointed out in the introduction to this section, the Institute of Public Affairs will plan and develop, during the 1968-69 fiscal year, a program of in-service training in local government management. This will be done in cooperation with other educational agencies and associations of local government officials in Iowa. It will be financed in part by a grant from the federal government under Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964.

In addition to the surveys previously discussed, this past year the Institute staff has been able to contact key persons in government and education concerning the development of the program. The Institute has been able to sound them out to get their views about possible ways to carry out the program, about the availability of teaching resources and manpower for a program of this type, and about their interest and support for it. In other words, preliminary contacts have been made that will aid in the development of a coordinated program and, it is hoped, in getting widespread interest and support for it.

What the Plan Will Include

A specific program has not been decided upon. However, it is anticipated that it will include, among others, the following general elements:

--A series of courses would be offered from which local government personnel could choose those best suited to their individual needs.

--Courses would be noncredit and would be offered at a number of attendance centers throughout the state.

--Courses would be geared to the needs of managerial and supervisory personnel, but other local personnel would be able to enroll in the courses.

--Courses would be taught not only by regular school faculty but also by persons who are well-qualified with backgrounds emphasizing abilities and accomplishments in the public service.

--The program would be coordinated and would be on a continuing basis. Continuity of programming would be vital, for both the persons taking the training and the educational institutions involved.

--Recognition by the educational institutions would be given for completion of a series of courses and, probably, for completion of individual courses.

The Plan of Action

To develop the program, it is anticipated that the following steps will be taken:

1. Print and distribute information about training needs to public officials and higher educational institutions.

2. Visit other states which have management training programs on a continuing basis for local officials. Also visit national associations which are particularly interested in training.

3. Appoint two advisory committees, one of local public officials and the other of educators, to work on the general plan of action, curriculum, and support for cooperative effort to carry out the program.

4. Develop several alternative plans of action and sound out the advisory committees, consultants, officials of state associations of local officials, educators, etc., about the plans.

5. Make a decision on the general plan and develop a curriculum of continuing education.

6. Work out the details of the plan.

    a. What the requirements for completion of a series of courses will be.

    b. How the courses will be offered.

    c. Where the courses would be offered (attendance centers).

    d. How the courses would be financed.

    e. How the over-all program would be administered.

    f. How to staff the program.

7. Determine the extent to which there are courses currently available which fit the curriculum.

8. Develop courses which are not currently available. As part of this and item "7," devise ways for modern teaching techniques and visual aids to be used in teaching the courses.

9. Gain interest and support for the program. This would be done coincident with other phases of the development of the program.

ERIC Clearinghouse
SEP 10 1969
on Adult Education